DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 402 24 EA 003 025

AUTHOR	Polemeni, Anthony John
TITLE	A Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 83-531) (89-10), after the Approved Funding Periods.
INSTITUTION	Saint Johns Univ., Jamaica, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-B-110
PUB DATE	Apr 70
GRANT	OEG-0-8-0801
NOTE	211p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$10.65
DESCRIPTORS	Bibliographies, Demonstration Programs, Developmental Programs, Educational Innovation, Educational Programs, Expenditures, *Federal Aid, *Federal Legislation, *Federal Programs, Geographic Location, *Incentive Grants, Literature Reviews, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires, School Districts, Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

To determine the continuation rate of Title III projects after termination of Federal funding in December 1967, questionnaire response data from directors of 149 projects were analyzed, and a study was made of the respective project proposals on file at the Title III bureau of USOE. For purposes of analysis, projects were categorized by operational status after withdrawal of funds: those immediately terminated, those continuing for a short period, and those remaining operative. Statistical analysis revealed no significant change in the relationship between the status of a terminated project and any of the five selected variables: (1) type of project (innovative, exemplary, adaptive); (2) geographical location; (3) size of student population served; (4) amount of Title III funds expended; and (5) percent of school district financial contribution. The study concludes with 11 recommendations for increasing the rate of continuation. Abstracts of the 149 projects are appended. (JK)

BR 8-B-110
PA 04
EA

ED041402

RESEARCH REPORT
Project No. 8-B-110
Grant No. OEG-0-8-0801

A STUDY OF TITLE III PROJECTS, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (P.L. 83-531(89-10)), AFTER THE APPROVED FUNDING PERIODS

Anthony John Polemeni, Ph.D.
St. John's University
Jamaica, New York 11432

April, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EA 003 025

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer expresses deeply felt appreciation to the adviser of this study, Dr. Jennie Venezia, for her encouragement, thoughtful advice, sustained interest and assistance in the study and in the writer. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. William Southworth and Dr. Joseph Halliwell for their assistance.

The writer is indebted to Dr. David Iwamoto, Chief, Program Analysis Section, the U.S. Office of Education, for his kind consideration in giving time and invaluable assistance.

Finally, the writer expresses heartfelt appreciation to his wife, Martha, for the love and support she has so freely given throughout the writer's doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. ii

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem
Definition of Terms
Limitations of the Study
Significance of the Study

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LEGISLATION AND LITERATURE. 11

III. SUBJECTS, MATERIALS, AND PROCEDURES . 30

Subjects
Materials
Procedures

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. 37

V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES 106

Summary
Recommendations
Recommendations for Further Studies

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 199

VITA. 202

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Summary of Questionnaire Return	38
2.	Number and Percent of Projects Categorized by Status Following Withdrawal of Title III Funding	40
3.	Number and Percent of Title III Section A Projects Classified by Type; Population Served; and Title III Dollar Expenditures for Each Type	42
4.	Number and Percent of Title III Section A Projects Classifed by Regions, Population, and Dollar Expenditures. .	44
5.	Section A Projects--Sources of Funding--Original Program	47
6.	Number and Percent of Title III Section B Projects Classified by Type; Population Served; and Title III Dollar Expenditures for Each Type.	51
7.	Number and Percent of Title III Section B Projects Classified by Regions, Population, and Dollar Expenditures . .	53
8.	Section B Projects--Sources of Funding--Original Program	54
9.	Number and Percent of Title III Section C Projects Classified by Type; Population Served; and Title III Dollar Expenditures for Each Type.	56
10.	Number and Percent of Title III Section C Projects Classified by Regions, Population, and Dollar Expenditures . .	58

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table		Page
11.	Section C Projects--Sources of Funding--Original Program	60
12.	Summary of Number and Percent of Title III Sections A, B, and C Projects Classified by Type; Population Served; and Title III Dollar Expenditures for Each Type	63
13.	Summary of Number and Percent of Title III Sections A, B, and C Projects Classified by Regions, Population, and Dollar Expenditures	64
14.	Number, Percent, and Chi-Square Analysis of Title III Projects Classifed by Type, and Section	67
15.	Number, Percent, and Chi-Square Analysis of Title III Projects Classified by Nine USOE Regions, and Sections A, B, and C	70
16.	Number, Percent, and Chi-Square Analysis of Title III Projects Classified by Population Range and Sections A, B, and C	72
17.	Number, Percent, and Chi-Square Analysis of Title III Projects Classified by Dollar Range and Sections A, B, and C .	75
18.	Chi-Square Analysis of Total Dollar Expenditure Classified by Funds Contributed by Title III Combined with Other Agencies, and School District Contributions.	78
19.	Summary of Chi-Square Analyses of Responses of Project Directors to Items of Category 5	80

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table		Page
20.	A Percent Analysis of Responses of Project Directors to Items 1-15 of Category 5	93
21.	Section B Projects--Sources of Funding--Following Title III Termination of Funding	94
22.	Section B Projects--Summary of Dollar Expenditure and Percents of Original Program for Administrative and Instructional Professional and Non-Professional Salaries, Materials and Supplies, and Contracted Services.	96
23.	Section B Projects--Summary of Dollar Expenditure and Percents of Title III Projects Following Termination of Funding for Administrative and Instructional Professional and Non-Professional Salaries, Materials and Supplies, and Contracted Services.	97
24.	Section B Projects--Total Population Served with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funds	98
25.	Section C Projects--Sources of Funding-Following Title III Termination of Funding	100
26.	Section C Projects--Summary of Dollar Expenditure and Percents of Original Program for Administrative and Instructional Professional and Non-Professional Salaries, Materials and Supplies, and Contracted Services..	101

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table		Page
27.	Section C Projects--Summary of Dollar Expenditure and Percents of Title III Projects Following Termination of Funding for Administrative and Instructional Salaries, Materials and Supplies, and Contracted Services	103
28.	Section C Projects--Total Population Served with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funds	105a
29.	Section B Projects--Dollar Expenditure by Administration for Professional Salaries with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funding	APPENDIX C
30.	Section B Projects--Dollar Expenditure by Administration for Non-Professional Salaries with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funding	APPENDIX C
31.	Section B Projects--Dollar Expenditure for Instructional Professional Salaries with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funding	APPENDIX C
32.	Section B Projects--Dollar Expenditure for Instructional Non-Professional Salaries with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funding	APPENDIX C
33.	Section B Projects--Dollar Expenditure for Materials and Supplies with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title IIII Funding	APPENDIX C

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table — Page

34. Section B Projects--Dollar Expenditure For Contracted Services with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funding. . . . APPENDIX C

35. Section C Projects--Dollar Expenditure For Professional Salaries with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funding. . . . APPENDIX C

36. Section C Projects--Dollar Expenditure by Administration for Non-Professional Salaries with Title III Funds and Following Termination Title III Funding. . . . . .APPENDIX C

37. Section C Projects--Dollar Expenditure For Instructional Professional Salaries with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funding. . . . . .APPENDIX C

38. Section C Projects--Dollar Expenditure For Instructional Non-Professional Salaries with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funding. . . . . .APPENDIX C

39. Section C Projects--Dollar Expenditure For Materials and Supplies with Title III Funds and Following Termination of Title III Funding.APPENDIX C

40. Section C Projects--Dollar Expenditure For Contracted Services with Title III Funds and Following the Termination of Title III Funding.APPENDIX C

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since 1963 the tempo of federal activity in the field of education has increased remarkably. The Congress has manifested an unprecedented willingness to become involved in educational policy formation and support. The passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was the culmination of a series of major policy thrusts on the part of the federal government in the field of education.[1]

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 represented a major new breakthrough in the development of federal educational policy. Former President Lyndon B. Johnson referred to the Act as "the greatest breakthrough in the advance of education since the Constitution was written." Many writers have considered the passage of the Act to be a milestone in the formation of educational policy at the federal level. "The action marks the assumption by the federal government of its appropriate and long-overdue role in assuring adequate

---

[1]Nicholas A. Masters and Lawrence K. Pettit, "Some Changing Patterns in Educational Policy Making," Educational Administration Quarterly, II (Spring, 1966), p. 81.

educational opportunity for all American children."[1]

The Act consists of six titles. The first five titles each represent a different federal educational program and Title VI (General Provisions) consists mainly of definitions of terms.[2]

Title I authorizes federal support to local public educational agencies for special education programs for educationally deprived children in attendance areas where low-income families are concentrated. Its aim is to help broaden and strengthen education for the children of poverty, wherever they may be found-in public schools, in private schools, or out of school.[3]

Title II provides funds to states for school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in all public and private elementary and secondary schools.[4]

---

[1]Robert E. McKay, "The President's Program" 'A New Committment to Quality and Equality in Education,'" Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (May, 1965), p. 427.

[2]The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, Public Law 89-10, Section 604.

[3]Ibid., Title I, Section 205.

[4]Ibid., Title II, Section 205 (a).

Title IV amends the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 to provide greater support for research activities in the field of education.[1]

The purpose of Title V is to upgrade state departments of education. Title V authorizes federal grants to state educational agencies to stimulate and assist in strengthening their leadership resources and in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet educational needs.[2]

Title III is designed to help local school districts relate research to practice through the support of creative supplementary centers and services. In this program, known as PACE--Projects to Advance Creativity in Education--school districts are encouraged to take a bold new look at their educational needs and to develop programs which illustrate innovative ideas as well as enrich curriculum.[3] PACE is designed to stimulate and assist local school districts to meet vital needs of education by: (a) encouraging flexibility, innovation, and experimentation throughout the educational establishment; (b) providing better services than are now available; and (c) supplementing existing educational programs and

---

[1] Ibid., Title IV, Section 2 (a) (1).

[2] Ibid., Title V, Section 500.

[3] Ibid., Title III, Section 301.

facilities.[1]

Because the committment of funds for Title III projects must follow appropriations by Congress, and priorities are subject to changes based on future project proposals, the grant periods will ordinarily be twelve months in length.[2] The present study was concerned with Title III projects of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which were funded in the early years of the program and whose funding period had ended as of December, 1967.

Statement of the Problem

With respect to these terminated Title III projects, the purposes of the study were 1) to determine the status of the projects following the termination of Title III funds; 2) to determine the relationships between the status of the projects following the termination of Title III funds and selected variables; and 3) to determine the reasons for discontinuance in the case of those projects which became defunct after the termination of Title III funds.

---

[1]U.S. Office of Education, Focus on PACE--Projects to Advance Creativity in Education (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 2.

[2]U.S. Office of Education, Supplementary Centers and Services Program: A Manual for Project Applicants (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 10.

The specific questions to which this study sought answers were:

1. In terms of

   (a) project type,
   (b) geographical location,
   (c) student population served,
   (d) Title III funds granted, and
   (e) school district financial contribution,

what are the characteristics of projects which, following the withdrawal of Title III funds as of December, 1967,

   (1) became defunct immediately,
   (2) were in operation for a period of time, but were defunct as of September, 1968, and
   (3) were still in operation as of March, 1969.

2. Does a significant association exist between the status of Title III projects following termination of federal funding and each of the following variables:

   (1) type of project?
   (2) geographical location?
   (3) size of student population?
   (4) total expenditures of Title III funds?
   (5) percent of school district financial contribution?

3. With respect to those projects which became defunct immediately after the withdrawal of Title III funds, or which functioned for a period of time but became defunct as of September, 1968, what are the reasons for their discontinuance in the opinion of the project directors?

4. With respect to those projects which functioned for a period of time following termination but became defunct as of September, 1968, and those projects which, following termination, were still in operation as of March, 1969.

1) from where did the projects receive support as compared to the original Title III project grants?
2) what were the yearly project expenditures for staff, materials and supplies, and contracted services as compared to the original Title III project grants?
3) what was the size of the student population served as compared to the original student population served by the Title III project?

Definition[1]

Supplementary Educational Centers. These are area facilities (organizational and physical) established for the purpose of planning, coordinating, and/or providing basic educational programs and services to students in elementary and secondary schools and to children youths, and adults in a group of communities.

Innovative. Invention of a creative solution to an educational problem and/or its arrangement into an organized activity which can be demonstrated.

Exemplary. Demonstration of a model program of the highest quality to test the feasibility of large-

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 1-9.

scale adaptation.

Adaptive. State in which innovation that has been demonstrated in exemplary program is adapted to local situations and put into widespread use. The adaptive stage serves to promote and perpetuate the acceptance and appeal of an innovation, and also to allow it to be adjusted to the unique requirements of a particular situation.

Mini-grant. A Title III project grant of less than $25,000.

USOE. The abbreviations for the U.S. Office of Education.

Limitations of the Study

1. Time. This study included all Title III projects which had their funding grant with the U.S. Office of Education terminated as of December, 1967.

2. Geographic Area. This study encompassed all Title III projects in the nine U.S. Office of Education regions which had their funding grant with the U.S. Office of Education terminated as of December, 1967.

3. Personnel. This study surveyed all the directors of Title III projects which had their funding grant with the U.S. Office of Education terminated as of December, 1967.

4. Scope. This study is delimited to those Title III projects which had their funding grant with the U.S. Office of Education terminated.

5. Materials. There were two basic sources of data for this study: 1) a questionnaire constructed specifically for this study; and 2) the Title III proposals on file at the U.S. Office of Education, Title III Bureau.

With respect to the honesty of responses on the part of the project directors, it was assumed that they responded truthfully to the items found in the questionnaire.

Significance of the Study

One of Title III's principal objectives is to act as a stimulant to effectuate meaningful change in the educational community. Much concern is being voiced by the nation's lawmakers, educators, and the American taxpayer as to whether or not the educational community is utilizing to its fullest the programs which have been spawned by Title III funding.

In October, 1967, forty-four education-minded members of Congress were interviewed by members of the staff of PACEreport, a publication which has as its prime purpose to provide Title III project directors with a continuing source of news and information on

educational innovation.[1] Some of the comments on the part of the nation's lawmakers indicate a need for a study of terminated Title III projects.

In one of the interviews related to Title III, Senator Peter H. Dominick of Colorado stated:

> I am specifically concerned about whether the programs conducted will have a lasting effect on the school-or if, when the money for a project is exhausted and the initial program is terminated, the tent will be folded with little or no imprint left on the educational process of the school system.[2]

Representative John N. Erlenborn of Illinois made the following comment:

> As we debate and consider this subject, we seek but find difficult to obtain, information of an evaluative nature such as...which of these innovative programs, if any, have been adopted as regular teaching programs?[3]

Finally, Representative William A. Steiger of Wisconsin observed that

> It would be useful to know the extent to which Title III projects are related to the (ESEA Title IV) educational laboratories and the regional centers funded under the Cooperative Research Act. If information is such that we see the program virtually in isolation from other programs, and this is generally the case, it is not very useful in making legislative decisions.[4]

---

[1]"View from the Top: Congressmen Look at Evaluation." PACEreport, November, 1967, pp. 5-8.

[2]Ibid., p. 5.

[3]Ibid., p. 7.

[4]Ibid., p. 6.

Aside from some informal findings by the U.S. Office of Education, Title III Bureau, there is no formal, follow-up study concerning the status of terminated Title III funded projects. There is a need for a study of this nature.

The findings of this study should give to present and future Title III officials on the federal, state, and local level, as well as to the nation's lawmakers, insights into the problem of continuance of Title III projects after the termination of the designated funding period.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LEGISLATION AND LITERATURE

When one considers all of the immediate and far-reaching problems which beset American public education today and the demands for more adequate and imaginative solutions, there is little wonder that the innovation-directed Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 was well received by the educational community.[1]

In order to understand Title III more fully, this chapter will present an overview of five areas. These five major divisions are 1) the initial ESEA hearings as they affected Title III, 2) the Title III guidelines, 3) changes in Title III legislation, 4) a fiscal review of Title III,and 5) a review of evaluation studies with respect to Title III.

Initial ESEA Title III Hearings

The House hearings on ESEA began January 22, 1965, with numerous administration officials explaining and

---

[1]Sidney P. Marland, Jr., "Issues for Change," PACEreport, II (October, 1968), p. 34.

supporting the various provisions.[1]

The aspect of Title III which became an object of frequent controversy in the hearings and floor debates was the direct relationship between the federal government and local school districts which this Title created. Unlike Titles I and II, all proposals under Title III would be acted upon by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.[2]

Although general agreements had been reached on federal-state-local relations, the specifics of those agreements were still subject to strong opposition. Representative Paul Findley, a Republican from Illinois, indicated that he could not support Title III in its proposed form. In the House debate, Representative Findley stated:

> I think that when the Federal Government steps in and makes these centers available for any purpose making them Federal-local schools, financed 100 percent by the Federal Government, this brings in a Federal influence on the State and on the communities in which they are constructed, which should not be permitted.[3]

---

[1]Report Prepared for the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the U.S. Senate. Richard I. Miller, chairman (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 19.

[2]The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, Public Law 89-10, Section 301(a).

[3]Congressional Record, 89th Congress, 1st Session, p. 5911.

Others who held such a view charged that Title III, in effect, established a dangerous new educational contest in which the Commissioner of Education had blank check authority over a separate system of Federal schools.

Senator Winston L. Prouty, a Republican from Vermont, argued that the provision in Title III which requires review and recommendations on proposals at the state level did not really represent any state control over Title III programs. Senator Prouty asserted that

> Title III of this bill, unlike Titles I and II, sets up a direct Federal-local partnership that bypasses the State Governments.
> The fact of the matter is that the Federal Commissioner can enter into a deal over the most strenuous protests of a State Commissioner of Education.[1]

This argument was sometimes carried to the point of predicting a fundamental change in the structure of the educational enterprise in the direction of federal domination if the bill was passed. Dr. Roger Freeman of Stanford University argued along this line in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee.

> It is obvious that the purpose of the pending proposal is not just to supply Federal funds to States and local districts. This plan aims at a fundamental change in the structure of American education. Its underlying assumption is that the present school authorities lack the knowledge and judgment of what the educational needs of their areas are and that only a program according

---

[1] Ibid., p. 7273.

> to the concepts of the Office of Education can meet the requirements. Once Congress acts on that assumption, where will it stop?[1]

During the House Subcommittee hearings, the broader question of federal controls, of which Title III plays an integral part, was often raised. It was argued that the ESEA legislation would provide for only enough federal control to assure that the purposes of the bill are achieved.

Dr. Bernard Donovan, Superintendent of the New York City Schools, at this House Subcommittee hearing, expressed the belief that some controls are necessary at any level of government if legislative intent is to be carried out. Dr. Donovan told the Subcommittee:

> We realize nobody will give money without any controls. I do not think we would ask anybody to contribute to the education of children without some controls. The state of New York contributes, and the city contributes. There are controls on the money, but the controls are general in nature. They are controls that are minimal.[2]

Before the acceptance of the ESEA legislation by the majority of the House of Representatives, the House Subcommittee rejected all amendments in which the supple-

---

[1]U.S. Congress, Senate, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965, pp. 2762 and 2765.

[2]U.S. Congress, House, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965, pp. 605-606.

mentary centers were to be administered by the state, but it did make a basic compromise with local interests by developing a dual conception of Title III's objectives.

The first objective was intended to meet national needs by underwriting models of exemplary programs aimed toward benefitting the nation as whole. The second objective was intended to allow local schools to meet their own needs through money for supplementary educational services.

On March 26, 1965, the ESEA bill passed in the House of Representatives, 263 to 153. Within the following week, the Senate passed the bill 73 to 18.[1]

As President Johnson signed the bill (Public Law 89-10) into law on April 11, 1965, he predicted that the lawmakers who supported this legislation "would be remembered in history as men and women who began a new day of greatness in American society."[2]

Title III Guidelines

A law is not a law until it is translated from abstract concepts into concrete guidelines and regulations that affect people. Congress writes a bill designed to accomplish certain things and general concepts are created to incorporate those intentions.

---

[1] Congressional Record, op. cit., p. 5969.

[2] The New York Times, April 12, 1965, p. 1.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in many ways exemplifies the success of the long and difficult struggle toward federal support of education. Through Title III, federal grants are not only provided directly to local schools but are intended for the express purpose of stimulating innovation and change in local educational districts.

> The Title III program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, called PACE (Projects to Advance Creativity in Education), is designed to encourage school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems; to more effectively utilize research findings; and to create, design, and make intelligent use of supplementary centers and services.[1]

The intent of the supplementary educational centers is to enrich the school program by meeting educational needs which are not being met through the regular school program.

An additional purpose of the centers is to develop and test model or exemplary school programs. Such programs are meant to be a stimulant to school districts to experiment with new approaches to educational problems, and to adopt new ideas which prove to be effective.

Plans are to be developed by local educational agencies and submitted to the U.S. Commissioner through the state office of education. The state is asked to

---

[1]U.S. Office of Education, Supplementary Centers and Services Program: A Manual for Project Applicants (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967). p. 1.

make recommendations on plans submitted by local agencies, but the U.S. Commissioner has the responsibility of approving or disapproving local plans.[1]

The local educational agency is required to involve a broad representation of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served in the planning and carrying out of Title III programs. Such organizations as universities, state educational agencies, nonprofit private schools, libraries, museums, and educational television stations should be included, depending on the type of project under consideration.[2]

Local school agencies are directed to plan supplementary centers in such a way that the services will be available to students enrolled in private schools as well as to students in the public schools.

Title III does not authorize any funds to be used to finance construction in private schools. All facilities that are constructed and equipment that is acquired are to remain the possession and under the control of a public agency. Representatives of private schools should share in the planning of supplementary programs, however, and private school children should share in the benefit

---

[1]The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, op. cit., Section 304(b).

[2]Ibid., Section 304(a).

of these programs.

Results of a National Catholic Education Association survey indicated that 1,029 or 17.9 per cent of the 5,754 (of 10,322) Catholic elementary school principals who responded had at least some students participating in Title III projects during the 1967-68 school year; 82.1 per cent said that their schools were not participating.[1] Even more interesting is that even though about the same percentage, 17.5 per cent expects to participate during the 1968-69 school year, 67.3 percent of the principals did not expect to participate and 15.2 percent were "not sure." Additionally, 286 or 19.3 percent of the 1,483 (of 2,293) Catholic secondary school principals who responded had at least some students participating in Title III projects; 70.5 percent do not anticipate participating this year. Ten percent were "not sure." This survey did not compare the number of public schools from the same geographic areas that were participating in Title III during the 1967-68 school year; neither did it indicate the quality of participation of students attending Catholic schools.

The Title III data with respect to the Catholic school community in the United States has been fragmentary, and yet to be seriously analyzed.

---

[1]Edward R. D'Alessio, "Title III and the Nonpublic School," PACEreport, II (October, 1968), p. 59.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education is directed to establish an Advisory Committee on supplementary centers and services consisting of the Commissioner who will act as chairman and eight other people appointed by the Commissioner and approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The committee is to advise the Commissioner on the development of guidelines by which the Title is to be administered and on the action to be taken on each of the applications which are submitted under the Title.[1]

The U.S. Office of Education works with state educational agencies in developing a long-range strategy for Title III or PACE. This involves bringing together leading educators for consultation, providing services to state education programs, and discovering and disseminating the result of inquiry and development in the educational change process.[2]

The state education agency has a major role in encouraging and helping to guide the development of regional supplementary education centers. However, in-

---

[1]The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, op. cit., Section 306(a).

[2]New York State Department of Education, New York State Supplement to USOE Manual for PACE Project Applicants (Albany: University of the State of New York), 1966, p. 4.

dividual school districts are encouraged to take the initiative by suggesting creative projects to meet regional needs, and by voluntarily coordinating their resources with those of other school districts.[1]

In its role as stimulator, organizer, and coordinator, the state education agency may provide staff, including specialists in all curriculum and service areas, to help local schools develop sound proposals.

It should be indicated once again that concern was repeatedly expressed in the hearings and debates relative to the question of federal control and the extent to which administrative guidelines would create unwanted and undesirable restrictions. In some cases, the concern reached the level of wondering to what extent the guidelines, in interpreting the broad intent of the Act, would actually formulate policy.

An examination of the Title III guidelines reveals that the primary emphasis in them was to insure that the money made available under the Act would be handled in a responsible way and would be used for the purposes intended. There were also sections in the guidelines, however, which may be interpreted as extensions of policy development. The best example of this is the section

---

[1]Ibid., p. 5.

which sets forth the five criteria by which the proposals under Title III will be evaluated.

> The advisory committee, therefore, has placed five important emphases that should be observed by local educational agencies as they initiate projects. First, the Committee feels that Title III of ESEA should not be as concerned with filling the need for services and centers as it should be with creating an awareness of need for new and imaginative programs and services.
>
> Second, recognizing that many local educational agencies will require support for the study of need, the observation of new practices, and the review of pertinent research, the Committee has decided to place high priority during the first year of the program on applications for planning grants. Third, priority will be given, at least during the initial phases of implementation, to innovation and exemplary programs. Fourth, projects should utilize all possible Federal assistance programs--for example, the resources of Titles 1, II, and IV of ESEA: Titles III, V-A, and VII of NDEA or other legislation which could relate to the project. Fifth, all appropriate community resources--educational, cultural, social, and scientific-- are to be drawn upon in planning, developing, and carrying out the project.[1]

These criteria clearly enunciated certain purposes to be achieved under Title III. Given the broad language in the Act, other criteria might well have been chosen which would have influenced the writing of proposals in quite a different way. The point is not whether or not the criteria chosen were good ones, but simply that in defining five criteria, the advisory committee was making policy.

---

[1]Supplementary Centers and Services Program: A Manual for Project Applicants, op. cit., p. 19.

Revision of Title III Legislation

A series of amendments to Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 were passed by the House and Senate on December 15, 1967.[1] The controversy over state versus federal control with respect to the administration of Title III again came to the forefront. These amendments, which constituted a revision of the initial Public Law 89-10, were enacted to strengthen the position of the states.

Congress voted to turn over to the states for their control seventy-five percent of the Title III appropriation. The remaining twenty-five percent of each state's Title III allotment is to remain under the U.S. Office of Education control.[2] This action went into effect July 1, 1968.

Under the amended legislation, the U.S. Commissioner of Education must approve state plans for fiscal 1969 and each subsequent year.[3] Any state wishing to receive its full seventy-five percent allotment of Title III funds in fiscal 1969 must first draw up, submit to

---

[1] Congressional Record, 90th Congress, 1st Session, pp. 17150-17153.

[2] U.S. Congress, Revision of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 90-247, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, 1967, Section 305(c)(d).

[3] Ibid., Section 305(b).

the USOE, and receive complete approval on its state plan. In order to receive funds to carry out the state plan under Title III, the state education department must appoint a "state advisory council" which is "broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the State...and of the public..."[1]

The responsibilities of the state advisory council include: a) advising the state education department on criteria for proposal approval; b) reviewing and making recommendations on each application submitted under terms of the state plan; c) evaluating state programs and projects; and d) preparing and submitting reports on state Title III activities to a national advisory council.[2]

As required by the amendments, the President of the United States is to appoint a National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. The Council will a) review the administration of general regulations for, and operation of Title III, b) review, evaluate, and transmit to the Congress and the President the reports submitted by the states, c) evaluate programs and projects carried out under this title and disseminate the results thereof, and d) make recommendations for the improvement of this title, and its administration and

---

[1] Ibid., Section 305(a).

[2] Ibid.

operation.[1]

Fiscal Review

Upon analysis of fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967 proposals, fifty-two percent of the proposals submitted to the federal government were approved for funding during 1967, while forty percent of the proposals submitted in 1966 were approved.[2]

Fewer Title III project proposals were submitted in fiscal 1967 than in fiscal 1966, but the average 1967 proposal requested $143,000, while the average 1966 proposal sought $92,000. Fewer proposals were approved by the federal government in 1967 than in 1966, but the average 1967 project cost $124,000, while the average 1966 project cost $69,000.

A breakdown of the expenditure picture is as follows: 1) in the fiscal year 1966, 1085 projects were approved, costing $75,000,000; and 2) in the fiscal year 1967, 918 projects were approved, costing $114,000,000.

In addition, in the fiscal year 1967 a total of 223 mini-grant applications were approved, costing $5,000,000, and over 700 projects for the fiscal year 1966 were carried into fiscal 1967 at a cost of

---

[1]Ibid., Section 390.

[2]Report from Analysis Unit, Plans and Supplementary Centers, "Monthly Status Report-ESEA Title III," June, 1968.

$15,000,000. These mini-grants were not included in this study.

Evaluation Studies

Overwhelmed by the vastness of such an undertaking as Title III and the many points of law, regulations, and amendments to the ESEA, it is easy to lose sight of a basic question: "Is the Title III program successful?" It is one thing to look at a number of Title III projects and judge intuitively that the PACE program is successful, and quite another thing to substantiate such an assumption.

There is need for more evidence to ascertain what real difference the federal dollar makes in education. This problem of evaluation has been one of Title III's most difficult problems on the local and national levels.

This section of the study will report on the evaluation studies which have been done, are currently ongoing, or are being contemplated with respect to Title III.

In 1966, the USOE asked Dr. Richard I. Miller, Director of the University of Kentucky's Program on Educational Change, to assess the quality of the Title III program and make recommendations for its improvement.[1]

---

[1]Report Prepared for the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the U.S. Senate. Richard I. Miller, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

This independent national PACE evaluation was made available in the Spring of 1967. Essentially, the Miller study was an analysis and evaluation of problems in the Title III program. It contained a series of recommendations for the improvement of PACE. It was a six months study which relied upon a team of twenty prominent educators who are experts in specific fields of study to evaluate specific problems or projects which relate to Title III.

Dr. Miller's study set forth some findings with respect to the unique characteristics of Title III. These characteristics were 1) that Title III is unique in its broad mandate; 2) it is 100 percent money to local agencies 3) PACE has a built-in requirement for community participation; 4) Title III establishes 50 state contests as well as a national one since approval is competitive; 5) it emphasizes innovativeness and creativity in its projects; 6) the extent of Congressional interest in the program is unique; and 7) the federal-state relationship is unique.

The USOE reports that so far it has funded a total of thirty-six projects in which the development of evaluation models is the major objective.[1]

---

[1]Dr. David Iwamoto, Chief, Program Analysis Section Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, USOE, private interview held in Washington, June, 1968.

The USOE is studying an evaluation model which could have a profound effect on evaluation at the local, state, and federal levels. It is an evaluation model designed by Daniel Stufflebeam and known as "CIPP"--Context, Input, Process, and Product.[1]

Stufflebeam and his Evaluation Center Staff have developed an evaluation "model," or approach, which centers around the fact that educators need to make decisions of an evaluative nature not only at the conclusion of an innovative project--but also before beginning the project, and as they proceed through it. Stufflebeam's model is being tested in the public schools of Xenia and Columbus, Ohio.

Stufflebeam designed the CIPP model so that it might be used to evaluate innovative projects at all levels--local, state, and national. Under the CIPP plan, local project personnel would collect evaluative information which might form the basis for local, state and federal decisions ~~decisions~~ which ultimately would come full circle and affect local project operations.

CIPP is divided into four parts--Context, Input, Process and Product--to reflect the four major types of

---

[1]Daniel L. Stufflebeam, "The Use and Abuse of Evaluation in Title III and a Description of a Proposed CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) Model for Evaluating ESEA Title III Projects" (Paper presented at the National Seminar on Innovation sponsored by the Kettering Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education, Honolulu, Hawaii, July, 1967).

decisions which should be made during the course of a Title III project. Each part is meant to be used during a specific time period in relation to the project. It is not absolutely essential, under the CIPP approach, to start from the beginning and work through the model. Each part can stand by itself.

Even with the emergence of newly developed evaluation models, the problem of evaluation still persists. It's possible to find that 80,000 teachers participated in Title III inservice activities during fiscal 1967, but how is it possible, on the state or national levels, to discover the difference this has made to youngsters in the classroom?

Whatever solutions are developed with respect to the Title III evaluation problem, it is imperative that the evaluation requirements leave enough room so innovative ideas and projects can continue to flourish.

The preceding paragraphs were concerned with Title III ongoing projects, but with respect to those Title III projects which have terminated their contract funding with the USOE, relatively little is known of their present status.[1] Thus, this study will add significant

---

[1]Norman Hearn, Chief, Program Analysis and Dissemination Branch, Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, USOE, private interview held in Washington, January, 1968.

data and dimension necessary for the development of a total appraisal of the Title III program.

CHAPTER III

SUBJECTS, MATERIALS, AND PROCEDURES

SUBJECTS

This study surveyed 166 directors of Title III projects which had their funding grants with the U.S. Office of Education terminated as of December, 1967. The 166 projects encompassed the entire population of terminated Title III projects. Of the 166 projects surveyed, 149 Title III projects contained usable responses which were analyzed for this study.

MATERIALS

There were two basic sources of data for this study: 1) a questionnaire constructed specifically for this study;[1] and 2) the Title III proposals on file at the U.S. Office of Education, Title III Bureau.

1A. The Questionnaire. The questionnaire constructed for this study was divided into five categories. Category One sought the name and address of the project director. Category Two sought the project title, its USOE project number, and its type according to the USOE classification. Category Three asked the project director to indicate 1) whether the project became defunct with

---

[1]The questionnaire constructed for this study is in Appendix B.

the withdrawal of Title III funds immediately at the end of the designated approval period (Section A Projects), or 2) whether the project was in operation for a period of time after the withdrawal of Title III funds but is currently not in operation (Section B Projects), or 3) whether the project is currently in operation since the withdrawal of Title III funds at the end of the designated approval period (Section C Projects).

Category Four was directed to those project directors who had been in charge of projects which 1) were in operation for a period of time after the withdrawal of Title III funds (Section B), or 2) were in operation as of March, 1969, since the withdrawal of Title III funds at the end of the designated approval period (Section C). These project directors were asked to indicate 1) the length of time the project was in operation after the withdrawal of Title III funds (Section B only), 2) the total yearly expenditure after the withdrawal of Title III funds, 3) the yearly cost for professional and non-professional salaries for administrative and instructional areas, materials and supplies, and contracted services, 4) the size of student population served, and 5) the sources of funding after the withdrawal of Title III funds

Category Five was directed to those directors who had been in charge of projects which were discontinued either immediately after Title III funding or after a

short trial without Title III funds. The items in this category included 15 statements to which the project directors were to reply with one of three options "greatly," "somewhat," or "not at all," to indicate the extent to which the reasons in the statements contributed to the discontinuance of the project. Additional space was provided following the last statement of Category Five to be used in case the respondent wished to clarify any answer or make further comments.

1B. Questionnaire Construction. The items for this instrument were selected through a study of Public Law 89-10, amendments to this law, a study of approved Title III proposals, and a review of literature with respect to Title III, such as the Title III local, state, and federal bulletins, and the Title III USOE guidelines.

Information was also obtained from discussions with several Title III Bureau Chiefs, the Title III Bureau Research Director, several Title III area desk personnel in Washington, D.C., and at least ten project directors.

1C. Validation of the Questionnaire. Content validation of the material in this instrument was based upon 1) official records, reports, correspondence, and publications of the Title III Research Bureau, Washington, D.C.; 2) the study of Law 89-10 and its amendments; 3) the Title III guidelines; and 4) periodicals, litera-

ture, bulletins, surveys, project proposals, reports, and personal visitations and observations of Title III programs.

Ten Title III project directors were selected at random and were invited to assist in the validation of the questionnaire.[1] By means of a telephone conversation, each of the ten project directors selected agreed to participate in this phase of the study. The participants were sent a letter indicating the purpose of this study and instructions for the completion of the questionnaire. Included with the letter was the questionnaire and an analysis of questionnaire form.[2] This analysis of questionnaire form was devised specifically for this study to assist in the content validation of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was revised to its final form in accordance with the comments and suggestions offered by the jury and by faculty members and students of the St. John's University doctoral seminar.

2A. Title III proposal. From the original 149 proposals on file at the USOE, Title III Central Processing Division, the following information was obtained: 1) the name and address of the project director; 2) the title of the project, the USOE grant number and region,

---

[1]A list of the ten jury members is in Appendix B.

[2]The letter and the analysis of questionnaire form is in Appendix B.

and the type of project involved; 3) the total dollar expenditure grant award; 4) the sources of funding other than Title III money; 5) the expenditure of money for professional and non-professional salaries in the administrative and instructional areas, materials and supplies, and contracted services; and 6) the student population served.

A brief description of each of the 149 projects under study has been given in Appendix A. These projects are categorized under appropriate descriptors in alphabetical order and appropriate sections. The grouping and description of the 149 projects was adapted from the publications concerning Title III of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).[1] In order to insure confidentiality, a number has been assigned to each of the projects under study.

PROCEDURES

The compilation of the Title III terminated projects under study was undertaken utilizing USOE files. This necessitated the cooperation of the USOE Title III Research and Grant Division. Each of the project directors was mailed a questionnaire with an enclosed letter informing them of the purpose of the study.

---

[1] Educational Resources Information Center, Pacesetters in Innovation--Fiscal Years 1966 and 1967 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966-1967).

Follow-up letters were sent to respondents. A second copy of the questionnaire was included.

Those respondents who did not return their questionnaires after the second mailing were contacted by telephone in an attempt to seek their cooperation.

Treatment of the Data

The data collected in response to items of the questionnaire and pertinent data collected from project proposals were analyzed employing appropriate statistical procedures for the four subproblems posed.[1]

In response to the series of questions posed in Subproblem One, percentage analyses were employed.

In response to the questions posed in Subproblem Two, percentage analyses and chi-square two-way classification analyses were employed. With respect to chi-square analyses, the null hypotheses tested for Subproblem Two assumed in each case that there was no significant difference between the observed frequencies and the expected frequencies on the basis of the independence of the two variables. The .05 level of significance was employed for the rejection of the null hypothesis.

In response to the question posed in Subproblem Three, answers were tabulated for each of the fifteen responses. The data were analyzed for frequency and

---

[1] Supra, p. 4.

percentage of responses. Statistical significance of the relations examined were determined by the use of chi-square one-way classification analyses. With respect to the chi-square analyses, the null hypotheses tested for Category Three assumed in each case that there was no significant difference between the frequencies observed for each of the item responses and the frequencies expected on the basis of equal preference.

In response to the questions posed in Subproblem Four, percentage analyses were employed.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analyses of the responses of project directors to the questionnaire items along with selected supplementary data on these projects available in the project application are summarized in this chapter in answer to the questions posed as subproblems in Chapter One. A discussion of these data is included in Chapter Five.

Questionnaires were mailed to directors of 166 projects with Title III funding terminated as of December, 1967. These 166 projects under study constituted the total population of projects with Title III funding which were terminated as of December, 1967.

As summarized in Table 1, 160, or 96.4 percent, of the 166 questionaires were returned; six, or 3.6 percent, of the questionnaires were not returned even after repeated requests by mail and by telephone. Of the six questionnaires which were not returned, two were located in Region 2, two in Region 5, one in Region 4, and one in Region 9.[1] Of the 160 questionnaires returned, 149, or 89.7 percent of the total mailed, contained usable responses which were

---

[1]The incorporation of the states into nine regions coincides with the U.S. government design (see supra, p. 43).

analyzed for this study. The reasons for the eleven non-usable responses were: ten project directors returned blank questionnaires and indicated that their projects were feasibility studies which were not designed to continue after the withdrawal of Title III funds;[1] and one questionnaire was returned blank along with a notation to the effect that the project director could not be located and there was no one in the district office who possessed the necessary knowledge to complete the questionnaire.

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN

Returns	N	%
Usable Returns	149	89.7
Non-usable Returns	11	6.7
Total Returned	160	96.4
Not Returned	6	3.6
Total Mailed	166	100

The responses of project directors in the 149 usable returns served as the data for this study, along with information available in project applications on file in the USOE, Title III Bureau.

[1]Feasibility studies are designed to ascertain whether certain programs would be of benefit to the community.

The analyses of these data for each of the subproblems under study follow in the sequence set forth in Chapter One.

Subproblem 1

In terms of
(a) project type,
(b) student population served,
(c) Title III funds granted,
(d) geographical location, and
(e) school district financial contribution,
what are the characteristics of projects which, following the withdrawal of Title III funds as of December, 1967,
(1) became defunct immediately,
(2) were in operation for a period of time, but were defunct as of September, 1968, and
(3) were still in operation as of March, 1969.

As summarized in Table 2, of the 149 Title III projects under study, 120, or 80.5 percent, became defunct immediately after the federal government withdrew its funds. In this study, these projects were termed Section A projects. Five projects, or 3.9 percent, were in operation following withdrawal of Title III funds for periods ranging from one month to one year and then became defunct. These projects were termed Section B projects.

As of March, 1969, twenty-four projects, or 16.1 percent, of the projects under study were still in operation following the withdrawal of Title III funds. They are presently supported by agencies other than the Title III Bureau.

TABLE 2

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PROJECTS CATEGORIZED BY STATUS FOLLOWING WITHDRAWAL OF TITLE III FUNDING

Section	N	%
A: Projects terminated immediately after withdrawal	120	80.5
B: Projects functioned for a time, now defunct	5	3.4
C: Projects continued after withdrawal, still in operation	24	16.1
Total	149	100

Section A Projects

Project type.-Title III projects are classified as one of three types, innovative, exemplary, or adaptive, based on the U.S. Office of Education Title III guideline definitions as interpreted by project proposers and subject to approval of Title III Bureau personnel.[1]

The Section A projects under study included many types of programs.[2] Some of the major emphases of the projects were: computer oriented programs, cultural enrichment programs, curriculum development, programs for disadvantaged youth, dropout programs, individualized instruction programs, inservice education, instructional

[1] Supra, p. 6.

[2] A brief description of each of these projects, adapted from ERIC, can be found in Appendix A.

materials centers, and vocational education programs.

Of the 120 Section A projects, 84, or 70.0 percent, were innovative; 33, or 27.5 percent, were exemplary and 3, or 2.5 percent, were adaptive. The size of population served and the amount of Title III funds spent on these Section A innovative, exemplary, and adaptive projects is reported in Table 3. This table includes the population and the expenditure figures for Section A projects as a whole, and the percents of this total for each project type.

Population.- The total student population served by the 120 Section A Title III projects under study was 8,908,389. Of this total, 7,777,827, or 87.3 percent, of the student population was served by innovative projects; 2,028,062, or 11.5 percent, of the student population by exemplary projects; and 102,500, or 1.2 percent, of the student population by adaptive projects. The combined population served by the exemplary and adaptive type project was 1,130,562, or 12.7 percent of the total population.

Title III funds granted.- The total Title III funds spent for the 120 Section A projects was $4,752,618. Of this total, $3,479,066, or 73.2 percent, was granted for innovative projects; $1,181,127, or 24.9 percent, for exemplary projects; and $92,425, or 1.9 percent, for adaptive projects. The combined funds spent on exemplary

TABLE 3

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TITLE III SECTION A PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY TYPE; POPULATION SERVED; AND TITLE III DOLLAR EXPENDITURES FOR EACH TYPE

Type of Project	N	%	Population N	%	Expended Dollars N	%
Innovative	84	70.0	7,777,827	87.3	$3,479,066	73.2
Exemplary	33	27.5	1,028,062	11.5	1,181,127	24.9
Adaptive	3	2.5	102,500	1.2	92,425	1.9
Totals	120	100	8,908,389	100	4,752,618	100

and adaptive type projects was $1,273,552, or 26.8 percent, of the total dollars spent.

Geographical location.- All federal governmental agencies, including the Title III Bureau, employ the following geographical categorization of the fifty states and Washington, D.C., into nine regions:[1]

Region 1-Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont;
Region 2-Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania;
Region 3-Washington, D.C., Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia;
Region 4-Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi South Carolina, Tennessee;
Region 5-Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin;
Region 6-Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota;
Region 7-Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas;
Region 8-Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Wyoming;
Region 9-Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington.

Section A projects were located in all nine of these geographical regions. The number and percent in each region, along with the population served by these projects and the amount of Title III funds spent, are summarized in Table 4.

Of the 120 projects under study 13, or 10.8 percent, were located in Region 1; 23, or 19.2 percent, in Region 2; 8, or 6.7 percent, in Region 3; 8, or 6.7 percent, in Region 4; 19, or 15.8 percent, in Region 5;

---

[1]Classification of states by region received from Analysis Unit, Title III Bureau.

TABLE 4

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TITLE III SECTION A PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY REGIONS, POPULATION, AND DOLLAR EXPENDITURES

Region			Population		Expended Dollars	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	13	10.8	169,396	1.9	$393,726	8.3
2	23	19.2	1,165,543	13.1	958,662	20.2
3	8	6.7	343,152	3.9	366,945	7.7
4	8	6.7	137,003	1.5	372,089	7.8
5	19	15.8	5,829,950	65.4	858,134	18.1
6	13	10.8	585,063	6.6	407,835	8.6
7	13	10.8	324,544	3.6	647,018	13.6
8	9	7.5	145,324	1.6	185,569	3.9
9	14	11.7	208,414	2.3	562,640	11.8
Totals	120	100	8,908,389	100	4,752,618	100

13, or 10.8 percent, in Region 6; 13, or 10.8 percent, in Region 7; 9, or 7.5 percent in Region 8; 14, or 11.7 percent, in Region 9.

In succeeding subproblems, data were analyzed in terms of four geographical regions combining the nine regions as follows: Regions 1 and 2: northeast; Regions 3 and 4: south; Regions 5,6, and 7: midwest; and Regions 8 and 9: west.

Accordingly, of the total 120 projects, 36, or 30.0 percent, of the projects were in the northeast; 16, or 13.4 percent, the south; 45, or 37.4 percent, the midwest; and 23, or 19.2 percent, in the west.

The 120 Section A projects served 8,908,389 students. Of this total, the northeast region served 1,334,939, or 15.0 percent; the south served 480,155, or 6.4 percent; the midwest served 6,739,557, or 75.6 percent; and the west served 353,738, or 3.9 percent.

Of the total Title III funds granted to the 120 Section A projects, which amounted to $4,752,618, $1,352,388, or 28.5 percent, was granted to projects in the northeastern region; $739,034, or 15.5 percent, was granted to projects in the southern region; $1,912,987, or 40.3 percent, was granted to the projects in the midwestern region; and $748,209, or 15.7 percent, was granted to projects in the western region.

School district financial contribution.- The

total dollar expenditure for the 120 Section A projects was $6,384,479. This sum represented the Title III funds granted as well as the contributions of school districts and other agencies. The total dollar expenditure on the part of the Title III Bureau, the school contributions, and other sources of project revenue is reported in Table 5.

Of the total dollar expenditure of $6,384,479 for the 120 Section A projects, the federal Title III funds granted was $4,752,618, or 74.0 percent; the local school districts contributed $1,532,321, or 24.0 percent; and university, foundations, and other federal granting agents contributed $99,540, or 2.0 percent.

Of the $1,532,321 spent by the school districts, $1,250,000 of this amount was accounted for by two school districts (project numbers 76 and 88). Of this $1,250,000, one project included an estimate for buildings and equipment ($820,000), and a second project included an estimate for land and a house ($430,000) which had been donated. The contribution of the remaining 118 school districts, then, amounted to $282,321, or 4.0 percent, of the total dollar expenditure.

Section B Projects

The five programs which functioned for a time following termination of Title III funds, but became

TABLE 5

Section A Projects

SOURCES OF FUNDING--ORIGINAL PROGRAM

Project Number	Total Amount Spent	Title III Funds	School Districts	Other
1	$ 18,296	18,056	240	
2	32,078	32,078		
3	11,000	10,000	1,000	
4	11,327	10,190	1,137	
5	138,234	134,734	3,500	
6	14,002	11,202	2,800	
7	25,320	25,320		
8	13,129	13,129		
9	18,384	18,384		
10	47,000	47,000		
11	84,496	84,496		
12	14,780	9,610	5,170	
13	44,475	44,475		
14	24,502	24,502		
15	123,100	123,100		
16	145,753	114,891	6,000	24,862[a]
17	30,235	21,685	8,550	
18	16,908	16,908		
19	23,641	21,816	1,825	
20	38,141	38,141		
21	103,539	103,539		
22	20,521	20,521		
23	54,654	54,654		
24	17,585	17,585		
25	17,606	15,920	1,686	
26	272,864	242,383	24,481	6,000[b]
27	10,970	9,970	1,000	
28	4,250	4,250		
29	32,000	32,000		
30	24,443	24,443		
31	26,261	26,261		
32	53,396	43,741	9,655	
33	41,664	41,664		
34	17,200	17,200		
35	6,600	6,600		
36	29,040	29,040		
37	10,200	10,200		
38	58,504	37,404	16,000	5,100[b]

TABLE 5--CONTINUED

Project Number	Total Amount Spent	Title III	School Districts	Other
39	133,692	133,692		
40	32,010	31,250	760	
41	15,970	15,330	640	
42	11,593	11,193	400	
43	75,000	71,000	4,000	
44	31,361	21,540	3,368	6,453[b]
45	98,746	98,746		
46	79,595	79,595		
47	17,683	17,683		
48	52,697	51,497	1,200	
49	67,692	54,592	13,100	
50	19,690	18,930	760	
51	167,789	167,789		
52	19,967	16,779	3,188	
53	15,750	15,750		
54	135,743	135,743		
55	28,542	28,542		
56	4,679	4,379	300	
57	16,691	13,191	3,500	
58	130,500	92,175		38,325[c]
59	1,892	1,892		
60	49,905	42,305	7,600	
61	19,550	9,400		10,150[d]
62	134,326	134,326		
63	93,800	93,800		
64	9,850	9,850		
65	56,132	45,900	10,232	
66	32,250	31,500	750	
67	8,977	8,977		
68	10,139	9,002	1,137	
69	74,028	74,028		
70	78,051	78,051		
71	67,796	67,796		
72	48,414	48,414		
73	27,290	27,290		
74	82,862	45,242	37,620	
75	16,245	16,245		
76	847,772	25,772	820,000[e]	2,000[f]
77	33,380	25,130	8,250	
78	52,352	35,352	17,000	
79	10,815	10,815		
80	5,528	5,528		
81	84,850	84,850		

TABLE 5--CONTINUED

Project Number	Total Amount Spent N	%	Title III Funds N	%	School Districts N	%	Other N	%
82	38,414		35,414		3,000			
83	55,960		46,140		9,820			
84	44,168		44,168					
85	61,022		49,022		12,000			
86	34,476		34,476					
87	27,620		27,620					
88	469,800		33,500		430,000[g]		6,300[h]	
89	33,292		33,292					
90	12,829		12,359		470			
91	26,273		20,062		6,211			
92	13,865		13,865					
93	30,614		30,614					
94	49,790		49,790					
95	14,110		14,110					
96	101,000		97,000		4,000			
97	34,050		29,750		4,300			
98	61,353		46,253		15,100			
99	4,900		4,900					
100	28,850		26,850		2,000			
101	27,986		27,986					
102	34,768		34,768					
103	10,663		10,663					
104	21,445		21,445					
105	22,190		22,190					
106	21,777		19,466		1,961		350[b-f]	
107	58,787		52,787		6,000			
108	73,850		68,350		5,500			
109	17,368		16,078		1,290			
110	9,706		9,706					
111	55,404		42,084		13,320			
112	43,500		43,500					
113	11,925		11,925					
114	3,616		3,116		500			
115	8,175		8,175					
116	14,650		14,650					
117	37,828		37,828					
118	18,514		18,514					
119	30,787		30,787					
120	41,462		41,462					
Total	6,384,479	74.0	4,752,618		1,532,321	24.0	99,540	2.0

[a]Foundation
[b]Title I (ESEA)
[c]Community Fund
[d]University
[e]Buildings, remodeling, and equipment
[f]Title III (NDEA)
[g]Land, house, donated
[h]Nature study Association

defunct, are categorized as Section B projects in this study. They included concerts for public schools, a performing arts program, individualized instruction, instructional materials centers, and a learning disabilities center.

Project type.- Of these five Section B projects, 3, or 6.0 percent, were classified as innovative; 2, or 40.0 percent, as exemplary. None of the five projects was classified as an adaptive type project. The size of the population served and the amount of Title III funds spent on Section B innovative and exemplary projects is reported in Table 6. This table also includes the total population and the expenditure figures for Section B projects as a whole, and the percents of this total for each project type.

Population.- The total student population served by Section B Title III projects was 23,988, of which the innovative type projects served 20,658 students, or 86.1 percent, and the exemplary type projects served 3,330, or 13.9 percent.

Title III funds granted.- The total Title III funds spent for the five Section B projects was $324,080. Of this total, $301,603, or 93.1 percent, was granted for innovative projects; and $22,477, or 6.0 percent, for exemplary projects.

TABLE 6

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TITLE III SECTION B PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY TYPE; POPULATION SERVED; AND TITLE III DOLLAR EXPENDITURES FOR EACH TYPE

Type of Project*	N	%	Population N	%	Expended Dollars N	%
Innovative	3	60.0	20,658	86.1	$301,603	93.1
Exemplary	2	40.0	3,330	13.9	22,477	6.9
Totals	5	100	23,988	100	324,080	100

* There were no adaptive type projects for Section B.

Geographical location.- Of the nine geographical regions, Section B projects were located in four. The number and percent in each region, along with the population served by these projects and the amount of Title III funds spent, are summarized in Table 7.

Of the five projects under study, 2, or 40.0 percent, were located in Region 2; 1, or 20.0 percent, in Region 4; 1, or 20.0 percent, in Region 6; and 1, or 20.0 percent, in Region 8. With respect to these five projects, 2, or 40.0 percent, were in the northeast; 1, or 20.0 percent, the south; 1, or 20.0 percent, the midwest; and 1, or 20.0 percent, the west.

The five Section B projects served 23,988 students. Of this total, the northeast region served 3,700, or 15.4 percent; the south served 19,136, or 79.8 percent; the midwest served 830, or 3.5 percent; and the west served 322, or 1.3 percent.

Of the Total Title III funds granted to the five section B projects, which amounted to $324,080, $209,806, or 64.7 percent, was granted to projects in the northeastern region; $34,923, or 10.8 percent, was granted to projects in the southern region; $15,977, or 4.9 percent, was granted to projects in the midwestern region; and $63,374, or 19.6 percent, was granted to projects in the western region.

TABLE 7

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TITLE III SECTION B PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY REGIONS, POPULATION, AND DOLLAR EXPENDITURES

Region			Population		Expended Dollars	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
2*	2	40.0	3,700	15.4	$209,806	64.7
4	1	20.0	19,136	79.8	34,923	10.8
6	1	20.0	830	3.5	15,977	4.9
8	1	20.0	322	1.3	63,374	19.6
Totals	5	100	23,988	100	324,080	100

Regions 1,3,5,7, and 9 did not have any Section B projects.

School district financial contribution.- The total dollar expenditure for the five Section B projects was $425,394. This sum represented the Title III funds granted as well as the contributions of school districts and other agencies. The total dollar expenditure on the part of the Title III Bureau, the school contributions, and other sources of project revenue is reported in Table 8.

TABLE 8

Section B Projects

SOURCES OF FUNDING -- ORIGINAL PROGRAM

Project Number	Total Amount Spent		Title III Funds		School District		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
121	$ 6,500		6,500					
122	34,923		34,923					
123	63,374		63,374					
124	302,306		203,306				100,000[a]	
125	16,781		15,977		1,114		200[a]	
Totals	425,394	100	324,080	76.0	1,114	1.0	100,200	23.0

[a]Foundation

Of the total dollar expenditure of $425,394 for the five Section B projects, the federal Title III funds granted was $324,080, or 76.0 percent; the local school districts contributed $1,114, or 1.0 percent; and foundations contributed $100,200, or 23.0 percent.

Section C Projects

The twenty-four programs which, following termin-

ation of Title III funds, were still in operation as of March, 1969, are categorized as Section C projects in this study. They included projects on atomic theory, computer programs, cultural enrichment, curriculum planning, educational television, family programs, individualized instruction, space centers, learning laboratory, library services, low achievers, music, natural sciences, remedial reading, socially maladjusted, and student exchange programs.

Project type.- Of these twenty-four Section C projects 13, or 54.2 percent, were innovative; and 11, or 45.8 percent, were exemplary. There were no adaptive type projects among the Section C projects. The size of the population served and the amount of Title III funds spent on Section C innovative and exemplary projects is reported in Table 9. This table also includes the total population and the expenditure figures for Section C projects as a whole, and the percents of this total for each project type.

Population.- The total student population served by Section C Title III projects was 865,318, of which the innovative projects served 683,392, or 79.0 percent, and the exemplary projects served 181,926, or 21.0 percent.

Title III funds granted.- The total Title III funds spent for the twenty-four Section C projects was $979,098.

TABLE 9

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TITLE III SECTION C PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY TYPE; POPULATION SERVED; AND TITLE III DOLLAR EXPENDITURES FOR EACH TYPE

Type of Project	N	%	Population N	%	Expended Dollars N	%
Innovative	13	54.2	683,392	79.0	$645,470	65.9
Exemplary	11	45.8	181,926	21.0	333,628	34.1
Totals	24	100	865,318	100	979,098	100

Of this total, $645,470, or 65.9 percent, was granted for innovative projects; and $333,628, or 34.1 percent, for exemplary projects.

Geographical location.- Of the nine geographical regions, Section C projects were located in eight. The number and percent in each region, along with the population served by these projects and the amount of Title III funds spent, are summarized in Table 10.

Of the twenty-four projects under study, 2, or 8.3 percent, were located in Region 1; 7, or 29.2 percent, in Region 2; 3, or 12.5 percent, in Region 3; 1, or 4.2 percent, in Region 4; 3, or 12.5 percent, in Region 5; 2, or 8.3 percent, in Region 6; 2, or 8.3 percent, in Region 8; and 4, 16.7 percent in Region 9. No projects were located in Region 7.

Of the total twenty-four projects, 9, or 37.5 percent, of the projects were in the northeast; 4, or 16.7 percent, the south; 5, or 20.8 percent, the midwest; and 6, or 25.0 percent, in the west.

The twenty-four Section C projects served 865,318 students. Of this total, the northeast region served 733,893, or 84.8 percent; the south served 58,736, or 6.8 percent; the midwest served 44,356, or 5.1 percent; and the west served 28,333, or 3.3 percent.

Of the total Title III funds granted to the twenty-four Section C projects, which amounted to $979,098,

TABLE 10

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TITLE III SECTION C PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY REGIONS, POPULATION, AND DOLLAR EXPENDITURES

Region			Population		Expended Dollars	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	2	8.3	84,201	9.7	$54,040	5.5
2	7	29.2	649,692	75.1	400,061	40.9
3	3	12.5	55,356	6.4	139,500	14.2
4	1	4.2	3,380	.4	43,944	4.5
5	3	12.5	40,960	4.7	129,340	13.2
6	2	8.3	3,396	.4	101,435	10.4
8	2	8.3	19,989	2.3	22,812	2.3
9	4	16.7	8,344	1.0	87,966	9.0
Totals	24	100	865,318	100	979,098	100

$454,101, or 46.4 percent, was granted to projects in the northeastern region; $183,444, or 18.7 percent, was granted to projects in the southern region; $230,775, or 23.6 percent, was granted to projects in the midwestern region; and $110,778, or 11.3 percent, was granted to projects in the western region.

School district financial contribution (before discontinuance of Title III funds).- The total dollar expenditure for the twenty-four Section C projects was $1,461,817. This sum represented the Title III funds granted as well as the contributions of school districts and other agencies. The total dollar expenditure on the part of the Title III Bureau, the school contributions, and other sources of project revenue is reported in Table 11.

Of the total dollar expenditure of $1,461,817 for the twenty-four Section C projects, the federal Title III funds granted was $979,098, or 72.0 percent; the local school districts contributed $145,049, or 11.0 percent; and university, state departments, foundations, and other federal granting agents contributed $232,184, or 17.0 percent.

Totals for Sections A, B, and C

The total student population served by the 149 projects under study (Sections A, B, and C) was 9,797,698, and the total Title III funds alloted to these projects

TABLE 11

Section C Projects

SOURCES OF FUNDING-ORIGINAL PROGRAM

Project Number	Total Amount Spent N	%	Title III Funds N	%	School District N	%	Other N	%
126	$ 48,093		15,720		1,900		30,000[a]	
127	24,800		22.300		2,500			
128	31,339		22.980		5,348		3,011[b]	
129	223,230		103,230				120,000[a]	
130	35,200		31,200		4,000			
131	79,103		79,103					
132	48,194		43,944		4,250			
133	91,730		63,875		4,500			
134	22,982		19,282		3,700			
135	20,282		19,000		1,232			
136	188,976		154,801		10,200		23,975[c]	
137	19,257		15,174		2,785		1,298[d]	

TABLE 11-Continued

Project Number	Total Amount Spent N	%	Title III Funds N	%	School District N	%	Other N	%
138	$ 23,816		20,172		1,500		2,143[d]	
139	44,207		42,707		1,500			
140	221,000		74,000		43,000		29,000[e]	
141	18,937		14,937				4,000[d-e]	
142	4,212		3,812		400			
143	25,639		22,869		2,770			
144	22,363		17,691[f]					
145	38,944		32,471		4,538			
146	39,440		31,740				7,000[d]	
147	88,061		86,261		1,800			
148	33,378		33,378					
149	68,634		8,451		49,126		11,057[d-e]	
Totals	1,461,817	100	979,098	72.0	145,049	11.0	232,184	17.0

[a]Foundations
[b]University
[c]State Department
[d]ESEA Title I
[e]NDEA Title III
[f]student fees pay remaining balance

was $6,055,796. Of this total number of projects 100, or 67.1 percent, were classified as innovative; 49, or 30.9 percent, as exemplary; and 3, or 2.0 percent, as adaptive.

The populations served and the money alloted for the total number of projects categorized by type are summarized in Table 12, along with their percentage equivalents.

The majority of Title III funds, 73.1 percent, was spent on the 100 innovative type projects, while 25.4 percent of the funds was granted to the 46 exemplary type projects; and 1.5 percent of the total dollar expenditure was alloted to the 3 adaptive type projects.

In Table 13, the combined total number of Sections A,B, and C projects in each geographic region, and the population served and money alloted for these projects, grouped by geographic region are summarized with their percentage equivalents.

Of the 149 projects under study 15, or 10.1 percent, were located in Region 1; 32, or 21.5 percent, in Region 2; 11, or 7.4 percent, in Region 3; 10, or 6.7 percent, in Region 4; 22, or 14.8 percent, in Region 5; 16 or 10.7 percent, in Region 6; 13, or 8.7 percent, in Region 7; 12, or 8.1 percent, in Region 8; or 12.1 percent, in Region 9.

Region 2 had the greatest number of the total

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TITLE III SECTIONS A, B, AND C PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY TYPE; POPULATION SERVED; AND TITLE III DOLLAR EXPENDITURES FOR EACH TYPE

Type of Project	Total N	Total %	Population N	Population %	Expended Dollars N	Expended Dollars %
Innovative	100	67.1	8,481,877	86.6	$4,426,139	73.1
Exemplary	46	30.9	1,213,318	12.4	1,537,232	25.4
Adaptive	3	2.0	102,500	1.0	92,425	1.5
Totals	149	100	9,797,698	100	6,055,796	100

TABLE 13

SUMMARY OF NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TITLE III SECTIONS A, B, AND C PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY REGIONS, POPULATION, AND DOLLAR EXPENDITURES

Region	Total A,B,C Projects		Population		Expended Dollars	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	15	10.1	253,597	2.6	$447,766	7.4
2	32	21.5	1,818,935	18.6	1,568,529	25.9
3	11	7.4	398,508	4.1	506,445	8.4
4	10	6.7	159,519	1.6	450,956	7.4
5	22	14.8	5,870,910	59.9	987,474	16.3
6	16	10.7	589,289	6.0	525,247	8.7
7	13	8.7	324,544	3.3	647,018	10.7
8	12	8.1	165,635	1.7	271,755	4.5
9	18	12.1	216,758	2.2	650,606	10.7
Totals	149	100	9,797,695	100	6,055,796	100

projects funded - 32, or 21.5 percent, and spent the most money-$1,508,529, or 25.9 percent of the total dollar expenditure. The greatest population served was in Region 5, which served 59.9 percent of the total population under study.

With respect to the breakdown of the nine regions into four larger geographical areas, the northeast served 2,072,532, or 21.2 percent, of the student population, while expending $2,016,295, or 33.3 percent, of the Title III funds; the south served 558,027, or 5.7 percent, of the student population, while expending $957,401, or 15.8 percent of the Title III funds; the midwest served 6,784,743, or 69.2 percent, of the student population, while expending $2,159,739, or 35.7 of the Title III funds; the west served 382,393, or 3.9 percent, of the student population, while expending $922,361, or 15.2 percent, of the Title III funds.

The total dollar expenditure for the 149 Title III projects (Sections, A, B, and C) under study, combining the contributions on the part of the school districts and other agencies with the Title III grants, was $8,271,690. Of this $8,271,690, the Title III funds amounted to $6,055,796, or 74.0 percent, of the total dollar expenditure; the school districts contributed $1,678,484, or 21.0 percent; and the other agencies combined contributed $431,924, or 5.0 percent, of the

total dollars spent.

Subproblem 2

Does a significant association exist between the status of Title III projects following termination of federal funding and each of the following variables:

1) type of project?
2) geographical location?
3) size of student population served?
4) total expenditures of Title III funds?
5) percent of school district financial contributions?

Project type.- As noted in a previous section, of the total 149 projects under study, 100 projects were innovative, 46 were exemplary, and 3 were adaptive.

Of the 100 innovative type projects, 84, or 84.0 percent, were Section A projects; 3, or 3.0 percent, were Section B projects; and 13, or 13.0 percent, were Section C projects. Of the 46 exemplary type projects, 33, or 71.7 percent, were Section A projects; 2 or 4.4 percent, were Section B projects; and 11, or 23.9 percent, were Section C projects. Of the 3 adaptive type projects, 3, or 100 percent, were Section A projects.

Number and percents of Section A, B, and C projects, and those projects which were innovative, exemplary, and adaptive are presented in Table 14.

Chi-square analysis was performed to determine if a significant association existed between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds, Sections A, B, and C projects, and the type

TABLE 14

NUMBER, PERCENT, AND CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF TITLE III PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY TYPE, AND SECTION

Type	Section A N	A %	B N	B %	C N	C %	Totals N	Totals %
Innovative	84	84.0	3	3.0	13	13.0	100	100
Exemplary	33	71.7	2	4.4	11	23.9	46	100
Adaptive	3	100.0					3	100
Totals	120		5		24		149	

Type	Section A+B f_o	A+B f_e	C f_o	C f_e	Totals
Innovative	87	83.9	13	16.1	100
Exemplary and Adaptive	38	41.1	11	7.9	49
Totals	125	125	24	24	149

$\chi^2 = 2.013$ df=1 $p > .05$

of project, innovative, exemplary and adaptive.

Because of the small expected frequencies in a number of cells of the 3x3 contingency table, Sections A and B project frequencies, and exemplary and adaptive project frequencies were combined for the final chi-square analysis. The obtained chi-square value for the resulting 2x2 contingency table was 2.013 (df=1), which was not significant at the .05 level of significance.

As a result the null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there was no association between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the type of project.

Geographical location.- Of the 15 projects located in Region 1, 13, or 86.7 percent, were Section A projects, and 2, or 13.3 percent, Section C projects. In Region 2, 23, or 71.9 percent, were Section A projects, 2, or 6.2 percent, Section B projects, and 7, or 21.9 percent, were Section C projects. Of the 11 projects in Region 3, 8, or 72.7 percent, were Section A projects, and 3, or 27.3 percent, were Section C projects. Of the 10 projects in Region 4, 8, or 80.0 percent, were Section A projects, 1, or 10.0 percent, were Section B projects, and 1, or 10.0 percent, were Section C projects. Of the 22 projects in Region 5, 19, or 86.4 percent, were Section A projects, and 3, or 13.6 percent, were Section

C projects. Of the 16 projects in Region 6, 13, or 81.2 percent were Section A projects, 1, or 6.3 percent, were Section B projects, and 2, or 12.5 percent, were Section C projects. Of the 13 projects in Region 7, 13, or 100 percent, were Section A projects. Of the 12 projects in Region 8, 9, or 75.0 percent, were Section A projects, 1, or 8.3 percent, were Section B projects, and 2, or 16.7 percent, were Section C projects. Of the 18 projects in Region 9, 14, or 77.8 percent, were Section A projects. and 4, or 22.2 percent, were Section C projects.

Numbers and percents of Section A, B, and C projects, in each of the geographical regions, are presented in Table 15.

Chi-square analysis was performed to determine if a significant association existed between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the geographical location.

Because of the small expected frequencies in a number of cells of the 3x9 contingency table, the following cell frequencies were combined for the final chi-square analysis: Sections A and B;Region 1 and 2 (northeastern states); Regions 3 and 4 (southern states); Regions 5,6, and 7 (mid-western states); and Regions 8 and 9 (western states). The obtained chi-square value for the resulting 2x4 contingency table was 2.276 (df=3),

TABLE 15

NUMBER, PERCENT, AND CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF TITLE III PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY USOE REGIONS, AND SECTIONS A,B, AND C

Region	Section A		Section B		Section C		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	13	86.7			2	13.3	15	100
2	23	71.9	2	6.2	7	21.9	32	100
3	8	72.7			3	27.3	11	100
4	8	80.0	1	10.0	1	10.0	10	100
5	19	86.4			3	13.6	22	100
6	13	81.2	1	6.3	2	12.5	16	100
7	13	100.0					13	100
8	9	75.0	1	8.3	2	16.7	12	100
9	14	77.8			4	22.2	18	100
Totals	120		5		24		149	100

Regions	Section A+B f_e	f_o	Section C f_e	f_o	Totals
1 and 2	38	39.4	9	7.6	47
3 and 4	17	17.6	4	3.4	21
5,6, and 7	46	42.8	5	8.2	51
8 and 9	24	25.2	6	4.8	30
Totals	125	125	24	24	149

$\chi^2 = 2.276$ df=3 $p > .05$

which was not significant at the .05 level of significance.

As a result the null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there was no association between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the geographical location of the school district in which the project was located.

Population.- Fifty-seven of the projects under study served pupil populations in the 1-2,000 range. Of these 57, 43, or 75.4 percent, were Section A projects, 3, or 5.3 percent, Section B projects; and 11, or 19.3 percent, were Section C projects. Of the 39 projects which had pupil populations within the 32,001 and over range, 32, or 82.1 percent, were Section A projects, and 7, or 17.9 percent, Section C projects. The remaining 53 projects served pupil populations categorized in fifteen other population ranges. Numbers and percent of Sections A, B, and C projects, in each of these population ranges, are summarized in Table 16.

Chi-square analysis was performed to determine if a significant association existed between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the pupil population served by the project.

Because of the small expected frequencies in a number of cells, the following cell frequencies were combined for the final chi-square analysis: Sections A and B; the three population categories from 1-2,000 to

TABLE 16

NUMBER, PERCENT, AND CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF TITLE III PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY POPULATION RANGE AND SECTIONS A,B, AND C

Population Range	Section A		Section B		Section C		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-2,000	43	75.4	3	5.3	11	19.3	57	100
2,001-4,000	10	71.4	1	7.1	3	21.5	14	100
4,001-6,000	4	80.0			1	20.0	5	100
6,001-8,000	5	83.3			1	16.7	6	100
8,001-10,000	3	100					3	100
10,001-12,000	2	100					2	100
12,001-14,000	3	100					3	100
14,001-16,000							0	100
16,001-18,000	2	100					2	100
18,001-20,000	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	5	100
20,001-22,000	3	100					3	100
22,001-24,000	1	100					1	100
24,001-26,000	1	100					1	100
26,001-28,000	3	100					3	100

TABLE 16--CONTINUED

Population Range	A N	A %	B N	B %	C N	C %	Totals N	Totals %
28,001-30,000	1	100					1	100
30,001-32,000	1	100					1	100
32,001-and over	32	82.1			7	17.9	39	100
Totals	117*		5		24		146	100

Population Range	Section A+B f_b	Section A+B	Section C f_c	Section C f_e	Totals
1-6,000	61	63.5	15	12.5	76
6,001-24,000	23	20.9	2	4.1	25
24,001 and over	38	37.6	7	7.4	45
Totals	122	122	24	24	146

$\chi^2 = 1.911$ df=2 $p > .05$

Three directors stated they were unable to determine population figures.

4001-6,000; the nine categories from 6,001-8000 to 22,000-24,000; and the remaining four categories, from 24,001-26,000 to 32,001 and over. The obtained chi-square value for the resulting 2x3 contingency table was 1,911(df=2), which was not significant at the .05 level of significance.

As a result the null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there was no significant association between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the population served.

Total expenditures of Title III grants.- Six of the projects under study fell within the $1-5,000 range. Of these six projects, 5, or 83.3 percent were Section A projects; 1, or 16.7 percent, was a Section C project. Of the 33 projects which fell within the range of $50,001 and over, 25, or 75.7 percent, were Section A projects; 2, or 6.1 percent, were Section B projects; and 6, or 18.2 percent, were Section C projects. The remaining 110 projects are categorized in nine other dollar ranges. Numbers and percent of Sections A, B, and C projects, in each of these dollar ranges, are summarized in Table 17.

Chi-square analysis was performed to determine if a significant association existed between the status of the project following the termination of federal

TABLE 17

NUMBER, PERCENT, AND CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF TITLE III PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY DOLLAR RANGE AND SECTIONS A, B, AND C

Dollar Range	A		B		C		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
$1-5,000	5	83.3			1	16.7	6	100
5,001-10,000	11	84.6	1	7.7	1	7.7	13	100
10,001-15,000	13	92.9			1	7.1	14	100
15,001-20,000	14	70.0	1	5.0	5	25.0	20	100
20,001-25,000	8	66.7			4	33.3	12	100
25,001-30,000	12	100					12	100
30,001-35,000	11	68.7	1	6.3	4	25.0	16	100
35,001-40,000	6	100					6	100
40,001-45,000	8	80.0			2	2.0	10	100
45,001-50,000	7	100					7	100
50,001-and over	25	75.7	2	6.1	6	18.2	33	100
Totals	120		5		24		149	100

TABLE 17--CONTINUED

Dollar Range	A+B		C		Totals
	f_o	f_e	f_o	f_e	
$1-25,000	53	54.5	12	10.5	65
25,001-50,000	45	42.8	6	8.2	51
50,001 and over	27	27.7	6	5.3	33
Totals	125	125	24	24	149

$\chi^2 = .936$ df=2 $p > .05$

Title III funds and the money granted.

Because of the small expected frequencies in a number of cells, the following cell frequencies were combined for the final chi-square analysis; Sections A and B; dollar ranges $1-25,000; 25,001-50,000; and 50,001 and over. The obtained chi-square value for the resulting 2x3 contingency table was .936 (df=2), which was not significant at the .05 level of significance.

As a result the null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there was no significant association between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the money granted.

Percent of the School district financial contribution.- Chi-square analysis was performed to determine if a significant association existed between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the percent of the local school district financial contribution.

Because of the small expected frequencies in a number of cells of the 2x2 contingency table, Sections A and B project frequencies were combined for the final chi-square analysis. In addition, the Title III grants for Sections A, B, and C were combined with other agencies, exclusive of the local school districts.

The Title III dollar expenditure, the financial contributions of the local school districts, and the combined dollar expenditure of the other remaining agencies were computed into percents. These are reported in Table 18. The obtained chi-square value for the resulting 2x2 contingency table was 5.06 (df=1), which was not significant at the .05 level of significance.

As a result the null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there was no association between the status of the projects following the termination of federal Title III funds and the percent of the local school district financial contribution.

TABLE 18

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF TITLE III PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY FUNDS CONTRIBUTED BY TITLE III GRANTS, LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND OTHER AGENCIES

Source of Contributions	Sections A + B		Sections C	
	f_o	f_e	f_o	f_e
Title III and Other Agencies	77	83	89	83
School District	23	17	11	17
Totals	100	100	100	100
$\chi^2=5.06$	df=1		$p > .05$	

Subproblem 3

> With respect to those projects which became defunct immediately after the withdrawal of Title III funds, or which functioned for a period of time but became defunct as of September, 1968, what are the reasons for their discontinuance in the opinion of the project directors?

The answer to this subproblem is based on the analysis of responses of project directors of Sections A and B projects to the fifteen statements of category five. These fifteen statements were possible reasons for discontinuance of projects following the termination of federal funding.

Project directors were requested to indicate with one of three options "greatly" (G), "somewhat" (S), or "not at all" (NAA) the extent to which each of the listed reasons applied to the projects under study.

For each item, the usable responses were analyzed using appropriate chi-square procedures to determine if they deviated significantly from responses expected on the basis of equal preference. In each case a null hypothesis was proposed and tested.

The analyses of the responses of the project directors are summarized in Table 19. In this table, for each statement the frequencies and percents of usuable responses for each option are reported along with the obtained chi-square value (df=2) and its respective significance level.

TABLE 19

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE ANALYSES OF RESPONSES OF PROJECT DIRECTORS TO ITEMS 1 THROUGH 15 OF CATEGORY 5

Reasons		G[a]	S	NAA	TUR	χ^2	p	OR	NR
1. The school district couldn't absorb costs	N	54	32	22	108	14.89	.001	27	13
	%	50.0	29.6	20.4	100.0				
2. Evaluation findings were negative		4	13	86	103	117.73	.001	4	20
		3.9	12.6	83.5	100.0				
3. Lack of trained personnel		10	27	66	103	48.05	.001	5	21
		9.7	26.2	64.1	100.0				
4. Unfavorable public reaction		5	6	91	102	143.23	.001	4	23
		4.9	5.9	89.2	100.0				
5. Too much control on part of USOE		8	11	77	96	94.99	.001	0	29
		8.3	11.5	80.2	100.0				
6. Too much control on part of State Dept.		8	6	83	97	119.27	.001	0	28
		8.2	6.2	85.6	100.0				
7. Lack of administrative support at State level		9	16	72	97	73.83	.001	2	28
		9.3	16.5	74.2	100.0				

[a]Code: G-Greatly S-Somewhat NAA-Not At All TUR-Total Usable Responses
χ^2 - chi-square p-significance level OR-Other Responses NR-No Responses

TABLE 19--CONTINUED

	Reasons	G	S	NAA	TUR	χ^2	p	OR	NR
8.	Lack of administrative support at local level	N 6 % 6.0	15 15.0	79 79.0	100 100.0	95.15	.001	3	22
9.	Lack of administrative support at federal level	10 10.6	14 14.9	70 74.5	94 100.0	73.91	.001	3	28
10.	Greater need and importance for other projects	22 21.6	26 25.5	54 52.9	102 100.0	17.88	.001	7	17
11.	Project personnel unable to sell idea to school	5 4.9	19 18.6	78 76.5	102 100.0	88.29	.001	1	22
12.	Methods developed to continue were inadequate	18 19.4	25 26.8	50 53.8	93 100.0	18.25	.001	5	28
13.	The timing of funding	25 24.3	31 30.1	47 45.6	103 100.0	7.54	.05	2	22
14.	Project imposed upon teachers' time	3 3.0	11 10.9	87 86.1	101 100.0	127.54	.001	1	24
15.	Curriculum materials were inadequate	2 2.1	8 8.2	87 89.7	97 100.0	141.51	.001	1	27

In addition, in Table 19, numbers of "other responses" (OR) and "no response" (NR) for each statement are tabulated. For each item the frequencies noted under the heading OR includes both (1) the responses of project directors who did not respond with either G, S, or NAA, but did include a written reaction to the statement, and (2) the responses of project directors who did indicate a G, S, or NAA response but also included an additional reaction. For each statement, the frequency under the NR heading was the number of project directors who did not respond to this statement in any form. In the report of the results which follow in this section, in cases where "other responses" were indicated by project directors, these reactions were included.

Statement 1: "The school district was unable to absorb the costs of project after the withdrawal of funds." As shown in Table 19, the chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 14.89 (df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "greatly" more often than expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "not at all" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statements were "other responses" of the project directors to statement one and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

...the district did not have the funds to go it alone.

...at the present we are involved in so many new undertakings that we have not pursued this project further.

...the school district could not afford the project.

...school districts involved were not able to finance program without federal aid.

...it was misunderstood as a three-year project and funds were not available at this time.

...another year or two would have enabled us to expand into other schools to develop a broader base of community support.

...money wasn't available to continue it.

...it was a type which simply could not be financed with local funds and therefore was not continued after loss of federal funds.

...it is our opinion that the original proposal for the planning grant should have included a request for funds to cover three full years. Thus, it could have proved its worth.

...school district just didn't have money for staff and equipment.

...occuring in a year of fairly stiff salary negotiations, there was little money available for continuing the project independently.

...one year grant was just not long enough to allow the community to gear up to absorb the program which is felt would have happened.

...the program is needed. However, there wasn't local money.

...we are faced with a millage defeat-so how in the world can any financial support be given an experimental project?

...it was a question of money.

...this project was terminated due to lack of funds on the part of the school district.

...the factor which is final in the continuation of our program is inadequate funds as our local district cannot fund such a large program.

...due to financial bind we were unable to get off the ground.

Statement 2: "Evaluation findings demonstrated that the project did not warrant continuance." As shown in Table 19, the chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 117.73 (df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statements were "other responses" of the project directors to statement two and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

...office of education was not interested in evaluation as we designed it.

...the school agency was not anxious to continue this project believing that it required more intensive research and development we were not equipped to do at the time.

Statement 3: "There was a lack of sufficiently trained personnel." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 48.05 (df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than expected on an hypothesis

of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statements were "other responses" of the project directors to statement three and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

> ...there were too few local experts to fully implement it.
>
> ...personnel at the local level were not able to adhere or comprehend the original implied thesis of the project.
>
> ...unfortunately lack of trained personnel caused numerous administrative and public relation problems.
>
> ...the outside agency proved to be extremely unreliable and inconsiderate of children's time and efforts. Major reason for the discontinuance of the program was the lack of interest on the part of this group.
>
> ...unfortunately it was assumed that whoever read the project would be knowledgeable enough in that area to understand and interpret it.

Statement 4: "There was much unfavorable public reaction to project." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 143.23 (df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than would be expected on hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statements were other responses of the project directors to statement four and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

> ...there were too much provincialism. Interest was not evidenced in the generic but rather in the immediate and expedient.
>
> ...very unfavorable editorials by local newspaper killed everything. Editor is strong proponent of not allowing any federal intervention-definitely afraid of big brother.
>
> ...due to a few in the community that felt that too much was spent on administration, which would have been any at all, so much fuss was raised that the program was discontinued. Program was of great value but a few resisted it.
>
> ...a blocking action by a minority of the local school board caused a delay in application for refunding, which in turn was a detriment to further funding.

Statement 5: "There was too great a control exercised on the part of the U.S. Office of Education, Title III Bureau." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement was analyzed was 94.99(df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

Statement 6: "There was too great a control exercised on the part of the State Education Department." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this

statement were analyzed was 119.27(df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

Statement 7: "There was a lack of administrative support at the state level." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 73.83(df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statements were "other responses" of the project directors to statement seven and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

> ...the state people were very enthusiastic and gave strong support.
>
> ...because of priorities established by the state.

Statement 8: "There was a lack of administrative support at the local level." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 95.15(df=2), which was significant at the .001 level.

There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than would be expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statements were "other responses" of the project directors to statement eight and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

> ...this respondent feels it should be picked up by some new regional educational agency, an agency that is free of the administrative encumbrances that spelled its doom in this county.
>
> ...there was a change in personnel at the superintendent's level.

Statement 9: "There was a lack of administrative support at the Federal level." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 73.91(df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statements were other responses of the project directors to statement nine and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

...in our judgement, the greatest pitfall has been the administration from the Federal level.

...USOE area desk men are very expendable as are a good number of the other USOE personnel. You may get the word or direction from one person-two or three weeks later you call back-the person is no longer there and you get an entirely different point of view.

Statement 10: "Other projects demonstrated greater need and importance." The chi-square value obtained when the response to this statement were analyzed was 17.88 (df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than would be expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statements were "other responses" of the project directors to statement ten and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

...central cities projects were of greater importance.

...I don't know.

...apparently.

...because of priorities established by the federal government.

Statement 11: "The project personnel were unable to sell the program to the school district." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 88.29(df=2), which was significant at

the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statement was an "other response" of a project director to statement eleven and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

...the school was very excited about the project.

Statement 12: "The methods and procedures developed to continue the project without Title III funds was inadequate." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 18.25(df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than would be expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statements were "other responses" of project directors to statement twelve and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

...we made no attempt to plan for operational implementation.

...we had no intention of continuing project without federal funds.

...this aspect of continuance was not even considered.

Statement 13: "The timing of funding was a causative factor." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 7.54(df=2), which was significant at the .05 level. The tendency for the project directors to respond in a given direction in this item was less pronounced than on other statements.

The following statements were "other responses" of the project directors to statement thirteen and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

> ...a change in administrative personnel near the end of the funding plus a change in application dates were the main reasons.
>
> ...Request for grant was not approved approximately six weeks after the beginning of school and four months into the new fiscal year.

Statement 14: "The project was viewed by the local school agency as an outside program imposing upon the teachers' time and energies." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 127.54(df=2), which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly" or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statement was an "other response" of a project director to statement fourteen and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

...there was a lack of enthusiasm on the part of teachers to move into a flexible schedule.

Statement 15: "Curriculum materials were found to be inadequate." The chi-square value obtained when the responses to this statement were analyzed was 141.51 (df=2) which was significant at the .001 level. There was the tendency for project directors to respond "not at all" more often than expected on an hypothesis of equal preference among response options. Fewer directors responded "greatly' or "somewhat" than would be expected on the basis of this hypothesis.

The following statement was an "other response" of a project director to statement fifteen and reflected the direction of the analyzed response options:

...materials were found to be poor.

As summarized in Table 20, which is a percent analysis of responses of project directors to items 1 through 15 of Category Five, the option "greatly" was given in response by less than 25 percent of the responding project directors to every statement but one, namely, Statement One. In the case of Statement One, 50 percent of the responding directors selected this option.

The response option "somewhat" was selected by 25 percent but less than 50 percent of the project directors for reasons, 1, 3, 10, 12, and 13. There was no statement to which a majority of responding directors responded "somewhat."

Seventy-five percent or more of the responding directors selected "not at all" for Statements 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14 and 15. More than 50 percent, but less than 75 percent, of the responding directors selected the option "not at all" for Statements 3, 7, 9, 10.

TABLE 20

A PERCENT ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES OF PROJECT DIRECTORS TO ITEMS 1-15 OF CATEGORY 5

Percent Categories	Responses G	S	NAA
75 and more	0	0	8
50 - 74.5	1	0	6
25 - 49.5	0	5	0
Less than 25	14	10	1
Totals	15	15	15

Subproblem 4

With respect to those projects which functioned for a period of time following termination but became defunct as of September, 1968, and those projects which, following termination, were still in operation as of March, 1969.

1) from where did the projects receive support as compared to the original Title III project grants?
2) what were the yearly project expenditures for staff, materials and supplies, and contracted services as compared to the original Title III project grants?
3) what was the size of the student population served as compared to the original student population served by the Title III projects?

Section B Projects

Sources of funding.- As summarized in Table 8, the total dollar expenditure for the five Section B projects was $425,394.[1] Of this total, Title III funds amounted to $324,080, or 76.0 percent; the local school districts contributed $1,114, or 1.0 percent; and foundations contributed $100,200, or 23.0 percent. After the withdrawal of Title III funds, as is reported in Table 21, the total dollar expenditure for the five projects was $32,900. Of this total, the local school districts contributed $1,900, or 6.0 percent; and a foundation and industry contributed $31,000, or 94.0 percent.

TABLE 21

Section B Projects

SOURCES OF FUNDING-FOLLOWING TITLE III TERMINATION OF FUNDING

Project Number	Total Amount Spent		School Districts		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
121	$ 6,000				6,000[a]	
122	400		400			
123	1,000		1,000			
124	25,000				25,000[b]	
125	500		500			
Totals	32,900	100	1,900	6.0	31,000	94.0

[a]Foundation
[b]Industry

Total yearly expenditures.- As summarized in Tables

[1]Supra, p.54.

22 and 23, the total Title III dollar expenditure for the five Section B projects was $324,080, while the total expenditure for those projects following the termination of Title III funds was $32,900. There was a dollar difference of $291,180.

Of the total $324,080 spent for the five Section B projects, $60,558, or 19.0 percent, was for administrative professional and non-professional salaries; $172,582, or 53.0 percent, for instructional professional and non-professional salaries; $10,421, or 3.0 percent, for materials and supplies; and $20,842, or 6.0 percent for contracted services.[1]

Of the total $32,900 spent for those Section B projects after the termination of Title III funds, $23,406, or 71.0 percent, was for administrative professional and non-professional salaries; $1,000, or 3.0 percent, for instructional professional and non-professional salaries; $2,770, or 9.0 percent, for materials and supplies; and $5,224, or 16.0 percent, for contracted services.

Student Population Served.- As shown in Table 24, the total population served by the five Section B projects was $23,988, while it was 21,720 after the termination of

---

[1]A complete breakdown of each category in separate tables for Sections B and C is in Appendix C.

TABLE 22

Section B Projects

SUMMARY OF DOLLAR EXPENDITURE AND PERCENTS OF ORIGINAL PROGRAM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL SALARIES, MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, AND CONTRACTED SERVICES

Project Number	Administrative Salaries[a]		Instructional Salaries[b]		Materials & Supplies		Contracted Services		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
121	$ 1,500		5,000		c		c				6,500	100
122	850		12,300		3,278		9,692		8,803		34,923	100
123	16,500		23,500		990		11,150		11,234		63,374	100
124	40,101		131,728		5,840		c		25,637		203,306	100
125	1,607		c		304		c		14,066		15,977	100
Totals	60,558	19.0	172,528	53.0	10,412	3.0	20,842	6.0	59,740	19.0	324,080	100

[a]Administrative professional and non-professional salaries are combined.

[b]Instructional professional and non-professional salaries are combined.

[c]No funds were requested for this area.

[d]Includes Title III funds only.

TABLE 23

Section B Projects

SUMMARY OF DOLLAR EXPENDITURE AND PERCENTS OF TITLE III PROJECTS FOLLOWING TERMINATION OF FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL SALARIES, MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, AND CONTRACTED SERVICES

Project Number	Administrative Salaries[a]		Instructional Salaries[b]		Materials & Supplies		Contracted Services		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
121	$ 406		0		370		5,224				6,000	
122	0		0		400		0				400	
123	0		1,000		0		0				1,000	
124	23,000		0		2,000		c				25,000	
125	0		c		0		c		500		500	
Totals	23,406	71.0	1,000	3.0	2,770	9.0	5,224	16.0	500	1.0	32,900	100

[a]Administrative professional and non-professional salaries are combined.

[b]Instructional professional and non-professional salaries are combined.

[c]No funds were requested for this area.

Title III funds. The difference was 2,268. It should be noted that one project director was unable to estimate the number of students served after the withdrawal of Title III funds.

TABLE 24

Section B Projects

TOTAL POPULATION SERVED WITH TITLE III FUNDS AND FOLLOWING TERMINATION OF TITLE III FUNDS

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
121	2,500	3,500	1,000
122	19,136	18,000	1,136
123	322	100	222
124	1,200	120	1,080
125	830	a	830
Totals	23,988	21,720	

[a]No figure was given.

Section C Projects

Sources of funding.- As summarized in Table 11, the total dollar expenditure for the twenty-four Section C projects was $1,461,817.[1] Of this total, Title III funds amounted to $979,098, or 72.0 percent; the local school districts contributed $145,049, or 11.0 percent; and university, foundation, state department, and other federal funds amounted to $232,184, or 17.0 percent.

[1]Supra, p.60.

After the withdrawal of Title III funds, as is reported in Table 25, the total dollar expenditure for the twenty-four projects was $1,033,138. Of this total, the local school districts contributed $792,363, or 77.0 percent; and university, foundation, state department, and other federal funds amounted to $240,775, or 23.0 percent.

Of the initial twenty-four Section C projects; 18, or 75.0 percent, of the school districts contributed funds. Of the twenty-four projects still in operation after the termination of Title III funds, 20, or 83.3 percent, of the projects are being financed in part or in full by the school districts. As shown in Table 5, Section A projects (those projects which became defunct immediately after the withdrawal of Title III funds) were supported by 49, or 40.8 percent, of the school districts.[1]

Total yearly expenditures.- As summarized in Tables 26 and 27, the total dollar expenditure for the twenty-four Section C projects was $979,098, while the total dollar expenditure for the twenty-four projects following the termination of Title III funds was $1,033,138. There was an increase of $54,040.

Of the total $979,098 spent for the initial twenty-four Section C projects, $277,388, or 29.0 percent, was for administrative professional and non-professional

---

[1] Supra, p.47.

TABLE 25

Section C Projects

SOURCES OF FUNDING--FOLLOWING TITLE III TERMINATION OF FUNDING

Project Number	Total Amount Spent		Non-Federal School District		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
126	$ 25,000		6,000		19,000[a]	
127	8,000		8,000			
128	1,000				1,000[b]	
129	101,775				101,775[a]	
130	22,000		22,000			
131	12,000		12,000			
132	10,500		10,500			
133	63,875		63,875			
134	10,000		10,000			
135	19,000		10,600		8,400[a]	
136	560,000		510,000		50,000[c]	
137	55,000		14,000		41,000[a-c-d]	
138[e]						
139[e]						
140	80,000		80,000			
141	8,700		8,700			
142	3,600				3,600[f]	
143	12,000		12,000			
144[e]						
145[e]						
146	16,000				16,000[f]	
147	10,000		10,000			
148[e]						
149	14,688		14,688			
Totals	1,033,138	100	792,363	77.0	240,775	23.0

[a]Foundations [b]University [c]Industry [d]State Dept.

[e]No Figures [f]ESEA Title I

TABLE 26

Section C Projects

SUMMARY OF DOLLAR EXPENDITURE AND PERCENTS OF ORIGINAL PROGRAM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL SALARIES, MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, AND CONTRACTED SERVICES

Project Number	Administrative Salaries		Instructional Salaries		Materials & Supplies		Contracted Services		Other		Total[d]	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
126	$ 4,180		6,440		125		c		4,975		15,720	
127	5,495		12,010		1,995		2,800				22,300	
128	15,000		c		c		c		7,980		22,980	
129	c		c		c		99,996		3,234		103,230	
130	10,200		20,000		1,000		c				31,200	
131	65,550		c		10,006		3,547				79,103	
132	5,518		30,480		4,629		561		2,756		43,944	
133	13,427		16,885		3,200		2,555		27,808		63,875	
134	13,302		c		c		c		5,980		19,282	
135	6,798		c		312		2,424		9,466		19,000	
136	39,998		30,166		5,000		c		79,637		154,801	
137	3,971		c		259		1,307		9,637		15,174	
138	4,000		15,972		200		c				20,172	
139	1,200		20,663		1,229		2,625		16,990		42,707	
140	38,100		c		3,500		32,400				74,000	
141	294		2,825		567		c		11,251		14,937	
142			2,105		531		940		236		3,812	
143	18,478		c		4,391		c				22,869	
144	1,625		4,469		1,665		c		9,932		17,691	

TABLE 26

Section C Projects-Continued

Project Number	Administrative Salaries N	%	Instructional Salaries N	%	Materials & Supplies N	%	Contracted Services N	%	Other N	%	Total N	%
145	2,054		22,223		2,852		c		5,342		32,471	
146	10,789		7,700		3,089		1,000		9,162		31,740	
147	10,324		49,357		1,735		1,833		23,012		86,26	
148	1,459		7,531		713		c		23,675		33,378	
149	5,626		2,825		c		c				8,451	
Totals	277,388	29.0	251,651	26.0	46,998	4.0	151,988	15.0	251,073	26.0	979,098	100

[a]Administrative professional and non-professional salaries are combined.

[b]Instructional professional and non-professional salaries are combined.

[c]No funds were requested for this area.

[d]Includes Title III funds only.

TABLE 27

Section C Projects

SUMMARY OF DOLLAR EXPENDITURE AND PERCENTS OF TITLE III PROJECTS FOLLOWING TERMINATION OF FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL SALARIES, MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, AND CONTRACTED SERVICES

Project Number	Administrative Salaries[a] N	%	Instructional Salaries[b] N	%	Materials & Supplies N	%	Contracted Services N	%	Other N	%	Total N	%
126	$ 1,200		6,800		7,000				10,000		25,000	
127	1,500		2,000		400		0		4,100		8,000	
128	0				1,000						1,000	
129	20,600				7,925		73,250				101,775	
130	0		20,000		2,000						22,000	
131	7,000		5,000		0		0				12,000	
132	7,000		0		3,500		0				10,500	
133	14,300		37,950		5,300		5,736		589[c]		63,875	
134	4,000				6,000						10,000	
135	5,000		5,000		8,600		0		400[c]		19,000	
136	45,000		141,000		66,700		200,000		107,300		560,000	
137[a]	0				0		0				55,000	
138[a]	0											
139[a]	0											
140	20,000		25,000		31,000		2,000		2,000[c]		80,000	
141			7,500		900				300[c]		8,700	
142	0		3,000		600		0				3,600	
143	0				12,000						12,000	

TABLE 27--CONTINUED

Project Number	Administrative Salaries		Instructional Salaries		Materials & Supplies		Contracted Services		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
147	1,000		8,500		500		0				10,000	
148[a]												
149	0		14,388		300		b				14,688	
Totals	127,100	13.0	290,138	30.0	154,725	14.0	280,986	30.0	125,189	13.0	1,033,138	100

[a]No figures were estimated in this area.

[b]No funds were requested for this area.

[c]For dissemination purposes.

salaries; $251,651, or 26.0 percent, for instructional professional or non-professional salaries; $46,998, or 4.0 percent, for materials and supplies; and $151,988, or 15.0 percent, for contracted services.

Of the total $1,033,138 spent for those Section C projects after the termination of Title III funds, $127,100, or 13.0 percent, was for administrative professional and non-professional salaries; $290,138, or 30.0 percent, for instructional professional and non-professional salaries; $154,725, or 14.0 percent, for materials and supplies; and $280,986, or 30.0 percent, for contracted services.

Student population served.- As shown in Table 28, the total student population served by the initial twenty-four Section C projects was 865,318, while it was 299,003 after the withdrawal of Title III funds. The difference was 566,315. It should be noted that five project directors were unable to estimate the number of students served after the termination of Title III funds.

TABLE 28

Section C Projects

Total population served with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funds

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
126	30	720	690
127	84,000	10,000	74,000
128[a]	340,542		
129	100,200	112,500	12,300
130	1,200	1,000	200
131	53,990	53,073	917
132	3,380	950	2,430
133	51,766	10,147	41,619
134	3,080	3,100	20
135	18,989	4,500	14,489
136	150,000	100,000	50,000
137	636	450	186
138	4,074	200	3,874
139[a]	1,200		
140[a]	40,000		
141	6,500	350	6,150
142	1,000	217	783
143	400	1,100	700
144[a]	166		
145[a]	560		
146	201	90	111
147	2,760	120	2,640
148	30	28	2
149	614	458	156
Totals	865,318	299,003	

[a]No figures were given.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

SUMMARY

With respect to the ESEA terminated Title III projects under study, the purposes of this study were 1) to determine the status of these projects following the termination of Title III funds; 2) to ascertain the relationships between these Title III projects and selected variables; and 3) to determine the reasons for discontinuance in the case of those projects which became defunct after the termination of Title III funds.

As was previously mentioned, one of the objectives of this study was to determine the status of Title III projects after the termination of their designated funding period. One-hundred fifty-six (excluding the ten feasibility projects) had funding periods terminated as of December, 1967. This study reported on the status of 149 of this number. Of the 149 projects under study, 120, or 80.5 percent, became defunct following the termination of Title III funds; five, or 3.9 percent, were in operation following funding termination for periods ranging from one month to one year, but then became defunct; and

24, or 16.1 percent, continued in operation following funding termination and were still in operation as of the fiscal year 1968-1969 at the time of this study. In this study these projects were classified as Section A, B, and C projects, respectively.

The fact that 16.1 percent of the projects under study were, as of the fiscal year 1968-1969 still in operation, funded by sources other than Title III, can be viewed in two basic ways. On the one hand, the comparatively small percent of the projects which continued, it could be argued, would indicate a failure on the part of the Title III legislation to achieve its objective of stimulating creativity and innovation in the field of education. Since Title III funding was in effect "seed money," it might be further argued that most of this "seed money" did not yield a sufficient crop of creative and innovative projects and ideas which would benefit the educational community. From this negative standpoint, the statistic 16.1 percent gives rise to some important considerations. Did the school agencies which were recipients of these grants intend to continue after the withdrawal of Title III funds? Were the project directors and/or planners aware of the intent of Title III legislation? Should there be greater controls on the part of the federal and state governments with respect to the problem of continuance after the withdrawal of Title III

funds?

On the other hand, however, it might be argued that Title III legislation provides "risk money" for educational experimentation. It is not "doomed to success' legislation. To deem Title III a success or failure simply in terms of the number of projects which have continued after the withdrawal of federal Title III funds is not legitimate, and does not take into account many positive outgrowths of these projects, whether they continued or not. Moreover, it might well be pointed out that at the initial funding stages of Title III projects, an implicit promise was made by the federal government to the school agencies that about 80.0 percent of the projects would be funded for a second year.[1] Because of Congressional action which resulted in substantially less money being available for Title III, this could not be done. Therefore, some planners did not develop in their initial program a plan for immediate local funding of the project if it was deemed worthwhile. In such light, then, the fact that twenty-four projects did continue after the withdrawal of Title III funds could very well be indicative of a measure of success of Title III legislation.

---

[1]Norman Hearn, Chief, Program Analysis and Dissemination Branch, Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, USOE, private interview held in Washington, January, 1968.

The Section A, B, and C projects encompassed many programs. Some of the major emphases of the projects were computer oriented programs, cultural enrichment programs, curriculum development, programs for disadvantaged youth, dropout programs, individualized instruction programs, inservice education, instructional materials centers, and vocational education programs.

The 149 Section A, B, and C projects incorporated three types--innovative, exemplary, and adaptive. The 120 Section A projects incorporated 84 innovative projects; 33 exemplary projects; and three adaptive projects. The five Section B projects incorporated three innovative projects and two exemplary projects. The twenty-four Section C projects incorporated thirteen innovative projects and eleven exemplary projects.

The total dollar expenditure for the 149 Section A, B, and C projects, combining the contributions on the part of the local school districts and other agencies with the Title III grants, was $8,271,690. Of this total, the Title III funds amounted to $6,055,796, or 74.0 percent; the school districts contributed $1,678,484, or 21.0 percent; and the other remaining agencies combined contributed $431,924, or 5.0 percent. The data revealed that of the $6,055,796 Title III amount, Section A projects spent $4,752,618; Section B projects spent $324,080; and Section C projects spent $979,098.

The total student population served by the 149 Title III projects under study was 9,797,698. With respect to the distribution of this population, Section A projects served 8,908,389; the Section B projects served 23,988; and the Section C Projects served 865,318.

When the nine USOE regions were combined into four larger geographical areas--northeast, south, midwest, and west, it was found that of the 120 Section A projects, thirty-six projects were located in the northeast; sixteen in the south; forty-five in the midwest; and twenty-three in the west. Of the five Section B projects two were located in the northeast; and the south, midwest, and west each had one projects. Of the twenty-four Section C projects, nine projects were located in the northeast; four in the south; five in the midwest; and six in the west.

With respect to the school district financial contribution, the local school districts contributed $1,678,484. Of this total, the Title III Section A projects contributed $1,532,321; the Section B projects, $1,114; and the Section C projects, $145,049.

In this study, an attempt was made to determine if a significant association existed between the status of Section A, B, or C projects following the termination of federal Title III funds and the following variables: 1) type of project; 2) geographical location; 3) size of

student population served; 4) amount of total expenditure of Title III funds; and 5) the percent of the school district financial contribution. In each case chi-square analysis was performed to determine if a significant association existed between the status of Section A, B, or C projects following the termination of federal Title III funds and the aforementioned variables. The null hypothesis tested in each case assumed that there was no significant difference between the observed frequencies and the expected frequencies on the basis of marginal totals.

With respect to the type of project, the data revealed that of the total 149 projects under study, 100 were innovative, thirty-six were exemplary, and three were adaptive. Of the 100 innovative type projects, eighty-four were Section A projects; three were Section B projects; and thirteen were Section C projects. Of the forty-six exemplary type projects, thirty-three were Section A projects; two were Section B projects; and eleven were Section C projects. Of the three adaptive type projects, three were Section A projects. As a result of the chi-square value obtained, the null hypothesis was accepted and it was concluded that there was no association between the status of the project following the termination of Title III funds and the type of project.

With respect to the geographical location, the data revealed that of the 149 projects under study, forty-seven were located in the northeast, twenty-one in the south; fifty-one in the midwest; and thirty in the west. In addition, these projects were then classified as to Section A, B, or C projects. As a result of the chi-square value obtained, the null hypothesis was accepted and it was concluded that there was no association between the status of the project following the termination of Title III funds and geographical location in which the project was located.

With respect to the student population served, the data revealed that of the 146 projects under study (three directors were unable to determine population figures), seventy-six fell within the 1-6,000 range; twenty-five within the 6,001-24,000 range; and forty-five within the 24,001 and over range. These projects were then classified as to Section A, B, or C projects. As a result of the chi-square value obtained, the null hypothesis was accepted and it was concluded that there was no association between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the population served.

With respect to the dollar expenditure of Title III funds, the data revealed that of the 149 projects under study, sixty-five fell within the $1-25,000 range;

fifty-one within the $25,001-50,000 range; and thirty-three within the $50,001 and over range. These projects were then classified as to Section A, B, or C projects. As a result of the chi-square value obtained, the null hypothesis was accepted and it was concluded that there was no association between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the dollar expenditure of Title III funds.

With respect to the percent of the school district financial contribution, the total dollar expenditures for Sections A, B, and C were computed into percents. As a result of the chi-square value obtained, the null hypothesis was accepted and it was concluded that there was not association between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the percent of the school district financial contribution.

Therefore, from the findings in this study it was concluded that there was no association between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and each of the following variables: 1) type of project; 2) geographical location; 3) size of student population served; 4) amount of total expenditures of Title III funds; and 5) the percent of the school district financial contribution.

With respect to the question of discontinuance of a project after the Title III withdrawal of funds,

the project directors were asked to respond "greatly," "somewhat," or "not at all," to fifteen statements, all of which were concerned with the reasons for discontinuance. It was found that 50.0 percent of the project directors selected the option "greatly," and 29.6 percent selected the option "somewhat," with respect to the statement "the school district was unable to absorb the costs of the project after the withdrawal of funds." This response again gives rise to the question as to whether or not the school districts or agencies did intend to continue their projects after the federal government withdrew its funds. The very fact that the inability to absorb costs after the withdrawal of federal funds was given as the primary reason for the discontinuance of a project leads one to believe that in many cases the school districts and agencies never intended to continue the funded program without federal assistance.

One recurring comment of project directors was that if the program had been funded for a longer period of time, the chances for its acceptance and its continuance would have been enhanced. One year was not considered a sufficient time for the development of an adequate staff and a complete implementation of desired objectives. It was not realistic to expect an innovative concept to develop and mature in the span of one year. As one project director stated: "A one year grant was

just not long enough to allow the community to gear up to absorb the program which is felt would have happened."

Some of the project directors indicated in their responses to the questionnaire in this study that the problem of continuance after the withdrawal of Title III funds was not even considered. This comment demonstrated 1) a lack of understanding on the part of the project directors concerning the real nature and intent of Title III legislation, or 2) a desire on their part to ignore the stated objectives of Title III legislation.

Upon investigation of the sources of revenue for the Section A and C projects, a trend appears to emerge. The 120 Section A projects were supported in part by forty-nine, or 40.8 percent, of the local school districts. The twenty-four Section C projects initially were funded in part by eighteen, or 75.0 percent, of the local school districts. After the termination of Title III funds, these twenty-four projects were being financed in part or in full by twenty, or 83.3 percent, of the local school districts. When compared in the light of Section A projects, a trend would seem to emerge. It appears that when local funds are included in the initial funded project, the tendency is for the project to continue after the withdrawal of Title III funds. When there is little financial commitment, there is the tendency for the project to become defunct upon the

withdrawal of federal funds. It might be said, therefore that a local commitment of funds enhances the prospects of the continuation of the project after the federal withdrawal of funds.

The data in this study with respect to the financial assistance of other federal agencies other than Title III revealed that of the initial total dollar expenditure of $8,271,690 for Title III projects, Section A projects received $19,903 in financial assistance; Section B projects received no assistance; and Section C projects received $55,198 in federal assistance. Federal financial assistance other than Title III funds for Sections A, B, and C projects amounted to $75,101, less than 1.0 percent of the total dollar expenditure.

After the withdrawal of Title III funds, the data revealed that Section B projects received no federal financial assistance; and that Section C projects received $19,600. The combined total dollar expenditure for Sections B and C was $19,600, or almost 2.0 percent of the total dollar expenditure of $1,066,038.

Because of its strategic relationship with the nation's schools as the developmental proving ground for other programs, the "need to relate Title III programs to other federal programs is an inherent need."[1]

---

[1]Robers L. Barton and Martha Russell Tiller, "The Need to Relate TITLE III Projects to Other Federal Programs," Theory Into Practice, VI (June, 1967), p. 141.

The aforementioned findings indicate that this has not happened. Title III projects have received very minimal financial assistance from other federal agencies. When one considers the vast array of other federal agencies, not to mention nongovernmental programs such as those sponsored by foundations, Title III has not been very successful in developing working relationships.

Upon further investigation of the data, it was found that with respect to the sources of revenue of Section B and C projects after the withdrawal of Title III funds, of the $1,066,038 spent for these twenty-nine projects, $137,175, or about 12.0 percent, was contributed by foundations. The $137,175 represents contributions from foundations for five projects. This finding indicated that foundations have not developed a working relationship with Title III projects. This finding further substantiated views given by a foundation director with respect to the relationship of Title III and foundations. It was stated very explicitly that private foundations do not intend to finance to any great degree Title III projects after the withdrawal of Title III funds.[1]

The data pertaining to the comparative analysis

---

[1]Homer Dowdy, Assistant Director, The Mott Foundation, private interview held in Washington, October, 1968.

of Section B and C projects revealed that the dollar expenditure for the five Section B projects fell substantially after the withdrawal of Title sII funds. Yet, at the same time, the student population served by Section B projects remained substantially the same.

The data further revealed that the total dollar expenditure for the twenty-four Section C projects indicated an increase over the initial Title III funds granted after the termination of Title III funding. In addition, there was a substantial drop in the student population served by Section C projects after the termination of Title III funding.

The increase of the dollar expenditure on the part of local agencies for Section C projects after the termination of Title III funding is an encouraging sign. It can be viewed as a sign of confidence on the part of the local agency to shoulder the burden of responsibility of a worthwhile program after the federal government has withdrawn its assistance.

In conclusion, the assessment of the data which have been under study has led to the development of recommendations in the ensuing paragraphs in an attempt to enhance and strengthen the ESEA Title III program on the local, state, and national levels.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions of this study:

1. Enough time should be allowed for the project to develop sufficiently so that it can function on its own, once the federal funds are withdrawn. An important aspect for the continuance of the project is this time element. If a biannum funding system were established, this could eradicate the crisis with respect to the timing of the funding, and it would give the program time to establish the necessary staff and stability needed. Another suggestion would be the establishment of a federal commitment over a five-year period. This financial commitment on the part of the federal government is already found in ESEA Title VII (Bilingual Education Program), and ESEA Title VIII (Dropout Prevention Program).

2. On the federal and state levels, it should be mandated that proposers of Title III projects be more explicit in their design for the continuation of projects after the withdrawal of Title III funds. Although the project director is asked to indicate how the project will be continued after the withdrawal of funds, inspection of a sampling of these proposals gave evidence of a lack of any concrete, definite plans for continuance.

3. It would be prudent for the federal and state agencies to be more selective in funding programs. It may be wiser to spend more time, talent, energy, and money on a few outstanding projects that can be demonstrated as being feasible, and whose ideas can be adopted by the educational community. There is a danger of thinning and weakening the buying power of the innovative dollar.

4. Congress might consider legislation that requires the local school district or agency that is a recipient of a Title III grant to make a financial commitment as well. The financial commitment need not be in the form of matching grants as with the National Defense Education Act, but a formula could be devised whereby the funded agency could be strongly urged to become involved more meaningfully in the program. One suggestion would be a scaled matching of funds by the local agency. Every year that the federal government is funding a project could witness a greater financial commitment by the recipient agency, so that in its final year of federal funding, the local agency will be fiscally responsible for 80 percent of the project. This would do much to insure a continuation of the program after the federal government withdraws its funds, and it would insure a greater degree of commitment by the local agency with every ensuing year. Thus, the problem which besets a local agency in not being able to absorb the costs of a

project after the federal government withdraws its funds could be somewhat remedied if such legislation is enacted.

5. Federal and state agencies should require all school districts or local agencies seeking Title III funds to demonstrate their financial capability to absorb and continue the proposed program, if deemed worthwhile, after the federal funds are withdrawn. This would be another factor insuring a continuance of the project after the federal funds are withdrawn.

6. The federal and state agencies must develop an effective communications program that will reach the administrators at the local level. The lack of awareness of the real intent and character of Title III on the part of the project directors, as indicated in this study, has demonstrated a need exists. If administrators persist in viewing Title III legislation in the same light as other federal and state programs, the chances for its success will be greatly diminished. School administrators, project directors, and project personnel should be involved in periodic inservice courses that would give them a better understanding of Title III legislation, as well as assist them in the administration of the projects.

7. The Title III programs should be urged and directed to work in closer liaison with other local, state, and federal programs. One suggestion is a

more cooperative working relationship with regional educational laboratories.

8. Local agencies should not rely upon foundations for financial assistance after the withdrawal of federal funds.

9. In addition to a financial commitment, a greater commitment of personnel and a greater community participation must be made on the part of local school districts and other agencies to insure the continuance of successful projects.

10. There is a need for a standard project proposal which would promote evaluation of project design and thus abet the production of meaningful research. Every year since its inception, the Title III proposal design has undergone change. This has resulted in a loss of time, in a loss of researchable data for evaluation purposes, and it has compounded the communications problem.

11. Greater supervision must be exerted by federal and state agencies with respect to the writing of the proposals. Too many approved proposals were haphazardly executed.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Because of its relative newness to the educational scene, there is a need for further research with respect to ESEA Title III. Additional studies could be developed in the following areas:

1. A study similar to the present study on terminated projects could be conducted after a lapse of two years.

2. An investigation of the degree of private school participation in the Title III programs.

3. A survey of directors of Title III projects to identify project characteristics, operational variables, and training needs of Title III project directors.

4. An evaluation of Title III state plans for the implementation of Title III legislation.

5. A developing of a new project proposal form that would lend itself to evaluation and meaningful research.

6. A developing of an evaluation instrument for Title III projects.

7. A developing of a plan for the effective dissemination of information of Title III projects.

APPENDIX A

A DESCRIPTION OF THE TITLE III PROJECTS GROUPED IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER UNDER APPROPRIATE DESCRIPTORS AND SECTIONS

Exhibit 1. Section A Projects

Exhibit 2. Section B Projects

Exhibit 3. Section C Projects

ABSTRACTS OF ESEA TITLE III PROJECTS[1]

Section A

Academic Enrichment

1. Regional Cooperative Supplementary Services Program. A regional center will be planned to serve students from 21 school districts. Specific school needs will be determined and new teaching methods will be tested. The program will cover all academic areas from preschool to adult levels with cultural enrichment a vital part of the program. Surveys will determine what projects should be given priority. Consultant services will be provided and all school districts will have the opportunity to become better acquainted with resources available in the region.

Accelerated Programs

2. Personal Acceleration of Curriculum Planning and Demonstration Project. Information related to the operation of a 12-month school with a paced program of instruction will be readily available to interested educators, government officials, and lay persons. A coor-

---

[1]The ESEA Title III project abstracts are categorized under sections and appropriate descriptors in alphabetical order. In order to preserve confidentiality, any information which will shed light as to identity of sponsoring agency will be deleted.

dinator will direct the demonstrations, write informative materials on the program, and schedule visitations. The school is the only public high school in the state authorized by the state legislature to conduct such a 12-month school program for 2 years.

Accreditation

3. Planning for School Improvement. New ideas in curriculum content, school organization, and learning resources will be studied in order to plan a model school system for schools in the state which now hold or are making plans to apply for AA accreditation. Progress reports will be prepared on recommendations made by a recent AA accreditation team. Exemplary practices will be studied and priorities established. Detailed guidelines for revisions of curriculum and organization will be written.

Art Instruction

4. Operational Grant for a Pilot Project in Art Enrichment Classes. A visual arts enrichment program will provide art instruction to approximately 100 public and 20 nonpublic school talented students in grades 4-12. The instruction will cover drawing, painting, print making, and manipulative experiences using tools and photography. Art appreciation activities will be included. Professional artists and traveling art exhibits will be used.

Atomic Theory

5. Development of Instructional Objectives for Radiation Science Program. Radiation science and nucleonic technology will be incorporated into the science and social science curriculums of junior and senior high schools in four school districts. Systems analysis techniques will be used to develop instructional objectives and materials. The instructional materials will be selected to ameliorate negative political, medical, economic, and educational attitudes toward atomic energy.

Audiovisual Aids

6. Planning of Educational Research and Information Services Center. A learning resource center will be planned to provide and demonstrate instructional media. A present county 16mm. film library will be merged with the resource center. Planning will also include an instructional materials consultant service to integrate multimedia materials into the curriculum, engineer and develop instructional materials, and provide inservice programs.

7. Educational Service Center. A two-county center will be planned to serve 208,000 public and nonpublic school students, teachers, and other professional workers. The following services and activities will be considered: 1) instructional media and resource services,

including evaluation of new equipment, teaching devices, and techniques, maintenance of television production, broadcasting, and taping facilities, and distribution of equipment and materials; 2) inservice education for professional personnel in counseling techniques, test administration and interpretation, and the use of educational television and audiovisual aids; 3) curriculum evaluation and development; and 4) specialized instructional consultant services.

8. Program for Inservice Training of Teachers in a Seven County Area. Three center will be set up to instruct teachers in the proper use of audiovisual equipment. At each center five 4-hour workshops will be conducted on Saturdays, directed by specialists in audiovisual aids and consultants from companies which manufacture the various materials and machines.

9. Curriculum and Cultural Center. A cultural and curriculum center will be planned to include an audiovisual materials center, art and cultural museums, a planetarium, and meeting rooms to disseminate information and to encourage learning.

Building Design

10. A Multiple School Site Plan. Four campus-type sites will be planned to house all elementary students in a city school district. Planning will include a

continuous-progress, nongraded, racially integrated system, total pupil-personnel services, outdoor education programs, summer programs, science and language laboratories, special education programs for handicapped students, and extensive use of such media as programed instruction, graphic arts, audiovisual materials, and instructional television. Each site will contain five separate classroom buildings and a central service building to house such special facilities as the auditorium, gymnasium, etc.

Community Resources

11. Innovative Education Center. An education center to centralize mass-media resources to improve the educational program of students and adults in scattered small communities with predominately spanish-speaking populations. The center will be considered as a research center where new ideas, materials, and techniques will be formulated, investigated and proven, and where teachers will be provided inservice education.

12. Developing Community Resources for Dynamic Education. A master plan will be developed to use community resources for the enrichment of programs in all public and nonpublic schools, grades 1-12, in the township. The skills and talents of persons in higher education, business, industry, the arts, and other fields will be used. The most successful techniques used in

other school systems will be studied and a pilot project will be conducted in the senior high school. The pilot program will involve students in a senior economics course. The objective will be to bring to the academic atmosphere of the classroom an association with the economic realities of the American free-enterprise system.

13. Educational Parks - Feasibility Study. The concept of educational parks for a metropolitan area will be examined systematically and extensively from a variety of perspectives and disciplines. Those models considered most meritorious will be pursued to the point where the participating cities will be able to reach major conclusions on immediate and future policy directions in each of the three cities. Systematic development will be made of the complete programing requirements of selected models for implementation.

Computer Programs

14. Teaching Mathematics Through the Use of a Time-Shared Computer. Three high schools will develop a plan for a mathematical laboratory based on a time-shared digital computer. A pilot program will be conducted, using three teletypewriter units, one at each school, to assist in planning computer-assisted instruction.

15. Survey and Evaluation of Educational Needs and Resources of a Four-County Area. A four-county survey and evaluation program will inventory available human and material resources and determine how to use the resources effectively to satisfy unmet needs of children. The pilot programs include a computer demonstration center to house data on pupils and to provide computerized instruction, a traveling science lecture-demonstration unit, and in inservice program for teachers.

16. School Libraries Automation Project. Computer technology will be used in cataloging, classifying, abstracting, coding, indexing, and programing library, audiovisual and other instructional materials, procedures, and services for schools in a county.

17. Automated Data Analysis for Instruction and Research. Techniques for converting student-written computer programs to automatic computer processing without manual operator intervention will be developed through a program planned to link traditional subject matter with a computer science knowledge. The computer will be used as a problem-solving tool for such disciplines as social sciences, mathematics, physical sciences, and business education. Computer science instructional units will be assembled for each subject area and will include syllabi, selected texts, materials, and computer programing problems.

18. Meeting Student Needs. Computers will be used to build a master schedule from course requests of students for demonstration purposes. The program will be used in a new high school and a new junior high. New and better ways of scheduling will be explored. Curriculum plans, time schedules, group instruction, course length, learning effectiveness, and teacher utilization will be studied.

19. Educational, Cultural, and Multi-Media Service Center. The feasibility of establishing a multi-media center with data-processing, instructional materials, cultural, and audiovisual divisions will be explored. The data-processing division would provide student record keeping and scheduling services, plus programed instruction. The library and instructional materials division would house books and audiovisual materials, video tapes, and a research library for advanced students. The cultural division would include a studio area for art work, training in material preparation for television work, etc.

20. Planning a Supplementary Program of Educational Services to Stimulate Innovation in the Design of Instructional Systems and Program Validation Techniques. A program will be planned for designing, implementing, and validating innovative instructional systems and strategies which employ available communication and

learning technologies. Such factors as linear and branching teaching systems, including computer-based instruction, materials for large group instruction, evaluation devices for various steps along the linear program, and grouping procedures for students will be considered.

Consultants in Child Psychology

21. Training and Utilization of Child-Behavior Consultants in the Schools. Teachers will be employed for a 6-week summer session to receive training as child-behavior consultants. They will plan a curriculum to help children whose behavior is momentarily or occasionally deviant and disruptive, develop awareness and skills to prevent deviant behavior, improve services offered to school staff members where such children are concerned, and demonstrate that such consultants can be useful staff members.

22. Training and Utilization of Child-Behavior in the Schools. Full-time child-behavior consultants will be added to the staffs of schools to provide preventive services to selected children. The consultant will act as a liaison between the child and/or teacher and school psychologists, social workers, guidance counselors, and administrators. Consultants will alert teachers to special curriculum materials available and help teachers detect behaviorial and/or learning problems.

Core Curriculum

23. Differential Education Programs in the Academic and the Fine and Performing Arts for Selected Students Who Show Intellectual or Creative Promise. Programs differing from regular school programs in the academic and fine arts areas will be planned for all students in a county who have intellectual or creative abilities. The programs will seek to strengthen the student's sense of the values of life by placing stronger emphasis on cultural education. Methods of discovering, motivating, and training talented students will be explored and programs planned to enhance specific aptitudes, general conceptual development, and personal development.

Cultural Enrichment

24. Cultural Creativity Through Opera. Plans will be made for a professional opera company to present programs for students throughout the state. The programs will expose the students to a professional performance which should give them some knowledge of opera and encourage the communities to develop their own opera programs.

25. Cultural and Fine Arts Enrichment Center and Services for Elementary and Secondary Schools. A cultural enrichment center will be planned to provide

cultural experiences and to stimulate academic achievement. The following cultural and fine arts activities will be considered: 1) orchestra training and fine arts activities; 2) creative art and craft work activities; 3) drama and speech activities; 4) Literary arts and communication skills program; 5) a health and physical education program.

26. Developing and Utilizing Cultural Resources. Cultural experiences will be provided to elementary and secondary students. The experiences will include field trips and programs in drama, science, music, and literature. Field trips will be taken to an art center, a western heritage center, a historical society museum, a science and arts foundation, a zoo, and a local museum.

27. Community Cultural Center with Multipurpose Educational Facilities and Services. A cultural center will be planned to include rehearsal and performance areas for high school music, speech, art, and drama groups, large group testing and instructional areas, and an assembly area seating 900 to 1,000 persons. The center could also be used for community performing arts programs, large-group community meetings, speeches, lectures, and other cultural activities. A student resource center will be planned for independent study and research purposes.

28. Study of the Feasibility of Implementing an Instrumental Music and Strings Program. A music education program will be planned for culturally disadvantaged children involving both appreciation of good music and participation in a stringed instructional music program. Extensive cooperation with the city symphony orchestra will be planned. Children's symphonic concerts will be introduced in the school system to increase student involvement and awareness.

29. Program of Outdoor Education. The purpose of the program is to make children aware of their natural heritage, promoting conservation, and providing opportunities for children of various geographic, religious, socioeconomic, and ethnic backgrounds to learn to work together.

30. Planning Grant for Model School. The educational and cultural needs of high school students and adults in an area including portions of two states will be surveyed. Objectives will be to raise educational achievement levels and to cultivate appreciation for cultural expression and the fine arts. Several avenues will be considered, including a year-round educational program for students and adults, supervised summer play, musical and ballet groups, classroom TV, adult education in the home, and extension of the science curriculum.

31. Intercultural Planning Project. A fine arts program is to be developed for strengthening intercultural understanding and interpersonal relations in a community. Groups representative of each of the subcultures in the community will present programs of their own art, music, literature, history, and language in the classrooms, on television, and at community concerts and exhibitions.

Curriculum Development

32. Developing a Future-Oriented Curriculum. A future-oriented curriculum model will be designed for grades K-6 to develop in children independence in learning, problem-solving skills, the desire to learn, and a capacity to adapt to and guide change. Curriculum will be planned to better prepare children for employment at jobs which do not even exist today.

33. Curricular Innovation. A center will be planned to meet the needs of the schools in a ten-city area. The center will 1) define the resources required to offer the educational and cultural services and activities which are beyond the capability of any single community, 2) stimulate and assist in the development and dissemination of curricular innovations, 3) develop working relationships between the schools and local scientific and technological industries, and 4) to coordinate existing programs in individual schools.

34. Planning for Curricular Innovation for Rural Counties. Educational and cultural needs of students in a three-county area will be surveyed to determine what services should be provided by a proposed educational center. Specific services which can be more effectively provided on a three-county basis and those which should be provided on a local basis will be decided. Consultant services on curriculum development and instructional problems will also be provided.

35. Language Arts Program. Planners will consider language arts needs not now being met. Establishment of objectives which will ultimately fulfill these needs, design of a language arts program which will complete the objectives, and provision for evaluation of the program will be studied.

36. School Development Program. A school development program will provide for 1) patterns of school organizations to accommodate the differences in individual student learning rates, 2) a curriculum that will provide continuity of instruction, and 3) the conversion of an area headstart effort for 4-year-olds into a nongraded program for children, 4 to 6, based on theories of the Gesell Institute. In addition, the initial training alphabet for linguistic instructional purposes will be appraised for its value at the early elementary school level.

37. Curriculum Planning. A basic curriculum will be planned for a reorganized county school system. Curriculum directors will study existing programs and coordinate the curricula in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Resource materials, texts, and teaching aids will be selected, present texts will be evaluated, better methods for grouping students will be recommended, and the feasibility of major and minor fields of concentration in high school will be studied.

38. Talent Unlimited. A supplementary learning center will be planned to provide activities and experiences for talented and gifted students. Plans will include finding ways to identify talented and gifted students and determining which activities would develop the capabilities of the students at a maximum rate. Facilities, personnel, equipment needs, and techniques for evaluating the services of the center will be decided.

Demonstration for Gifted Students

39. Plan for the Establishment of Exemplary Demonstration Centers and Innovative Programs for Gifted Students. A multicounty approach will be used to plan demonstration centers and programs for gifted students. Objectives are 1) the development of plans for a network of centers and programs, 2) involvement of nonparticipating school educators, community leaders,

and potential resource personnel, and 3) the screening and identification of children to be included in the operational phase of the program.

Demonstration Center for Middle School

40. Community-Oriented Middle School Model and Demonstration Model. A community-oriented middle school will be planned to serve students in grades 6-8. Planners will study instructional techniques, curriculum, programing, and organization focused on the needs of the students. Pupil personnel services will also be considered and preliminary architectural plans will be drawn for a physical plant to house the students.

Disadvantaged Youth

41. Cultural Enrichment Through the Dance. A demonstration dance troupe will be organized to serve as a means of artistic expression for disadvantaged secondary school students. The dances will be chosen from the folk traditions of the people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. After 4 to 6 months of training, the group will perform for other students and for community groups.

42. Planning for a Center for the Adjustment of Rampant Emotions. A temporary residence will be established in an urban area for socially and emotionally maladjusted teenagers, ages 13 to 17, who are experiencing difficulties living in their own homes. Many

students will be drawn from an economically disadvantaged environment. The students will attend their regular school during residence and will be assisted through tutoring and remedial work. Counseling and therapy for the students' social and emotional problems will be offered and counseling services provided for parents during the crisis period.

43. Learning Camp. A learning camp will be planned to serve students on the basis of educational need rather than educational superiority or ability to pay. The camp will be a boarding type. The camp program will be developed around a conceptual, nongraded curriculum, with variable grouping of students. A pilot program will be planned to test the effectiveness of planning procedures before final recommendations are made for building a permanent facility.

44. Ungraded Demonstration Primary Center Planning Study. A primary school will be planned to serve as a demonstration center for meeting the educational and cultural needs of culturally disadvantaged students. The curriculum will be planned to meet the specific needs of disadvantaged children, with special attention to developing reading and language arts skills. Curriculum materials will be continuously evaluated to determine which units are most useable and facilitate learning.

45. Organization Patterns and Exploratory Programs to Improve Education. A survey of existing facilities, programs, and personnel will be made and programs recommended to improve the curriculum and the cultural and educational opportunities for disadvantaged children. A plan for better utilization of facilities will be developed. Inservice training will be planned for school staff members.

46. Planning Exemplary Center for Education of Disadvantaged Youth. Programs will be planned to help disadvantaged students in the transition from elementary to junior high school and to provide materials and activities to improve the students' achievement levels. A curriculum information and analysis center will be established to study curricular needs, develop new instructional materials, and design new programs.

Dramatics

47. Project to Assist with Secondary School Drama. A program will be conducted to test the feasibility of exposing selected senior high school students from an eight-county area to a concentrated program of drama techniques, and to develop student leadership to assist teachers in upgrading high school drama productions. Participants will study stage techniques, theatre design, directing, and play production.

Dropout Programs

48. Project-Prevent Delinquency, Underachievement, Dropout. Programs will be planned to help alleviate the problems connected with dropout, underachievement, and delinquency. Delinquents will be identified and problem schools determined. The interrelationships of student, teachers, and educational organization characteristics within urban, semiurban, and rural areas will be studied to determine the factors producing dropout, underachievement, and delinquency.

49. Dropout Identification, Rehabilitation, and Education. The educational needs of more than 1,000 school age children who are not attending school will be explored and appropriate programs recommended for a county-wide area. The planning staff will include mental-health and special-education consultants, a sociologist, and an educational-research specialist.

50. Demonstration Teaching Center for Slow Learners and Disadvantaged Youth. A demonstration center will be planned for approximately 200 slow learners in grades 7-12. The program will also be aimed at helping dropouts return to school by providing vocational guidance, job placement, and general followup of the graduates of the program. The center's program will include guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, and a curriculum to meet the needs of these students.

51. Summer School for Dropout Recovery. Three summer school centers will be established for 300 high school level dropouts. The centers will operate with low counselor-pupil and teacher-pupil ratios, flexible scheduling for individual instruction, a totally ungraded program 2 hours daily of group or individual counseling for each student, and extracurricular student activities. During the 8-week session high school credits may be earned in english, social studies, mathematics, and electives.

Dual Enrollment

52. Junior High School Learning Laboratory. A learning laboratory will be established to help junior high school students who are slow learners. Approximately 15 students from public and private schools will participate on a full-time basis. Major objectives are to improve thinking and learning processes, to habituate the processes so they transfer to other learning situations, and to determine to what extent such practices will contribute to achievement.

Educable Mentally Retarded

53. Experimental Special Education Center for Educable Mentally Retarded Children. All children and youth between the ages of 12 and 17 who have been previously identified as mentally retarded will be screened and an experimental special education center will be

planned to serve them. A curriculum will be planned to meet the educational and training needs of the children.

54. Developing a Cooperative High School Work Orientation Program for Educationally Handicapped Youth. A Comprehensive work-orientation program will be planned to meet the vocational needs of high school students from eight counties. Special consideration will be given to the educable mentally retarded, the slow learner, and other students with special educational disabilities. Workshops will be used to plan and develop a curriculum for the program and for new teacher orientation.

Educational Television

55. Providing for the Most Effective Utilization of Educational Television. Educational television programs will be developed to serve the special needs of an agricultural and small-town area. Programs will include vocational agriculture, agriculture-business courses, elementary-level language courses, science, and mathematics. Cultural enrichment programs will include museums, drama, and music.

56. Closed Circuit TV. A closed-circuit television curriculum will be planned to enrich the regular curriculum and to meet the needs of gifted, educationally deprived, and special education students. Special attention will be given to developing programs for the

educationally deprived. Programs for the gifted will be planned in science and mathematics.

57. Planning for a Supplementary Multi-Media Educational Center. A multi-media approach will be used to improve the cultural and educational backgrounds of students in a county. Special attention will be given to researching the costs and comparative values of cable or leased-wire closed-circuit television systems. Television receivers would be placed in classrooms and subject-matter specialists would teach on a team-teaching basis. A means of orienting rural thought and education to the processes of metropolitan areas will be considered.

Emotionally Disturbed Children

58. Child Guidance Center Project. Child guidance services will be expanded to provide more guidance and counseling services to elementary school children. Emphasis will be on identification and correction of such psychological maladjustments as school phobias, anti-social behavior, and psychosomatic illnesses which may have prevented their attending school. Objectives are to return the children to classrooms, to raise the learning efficiency of emotionally disturbed children presently in classrooms, and to raise the level of teacher understanding regarding disturbed children. A psychiatrist and three psychiatric social workers will direct the program of individualized diagnosis and treatment.

English Instruction for American Indians

59. English Study Centers for Indian Students. Plans will be made to use modern foreign language teaching techniques to improve the vocabulary and habitual patterns of English usage of elementary school children on an Indian reservation. A language laboratory approach will be used with a tape series based on modern English linguistic principles.

Family Program

60. A Program of Exemplary Educational Services for a School District. Educational practices and program-management techniques will be studied to develop a family-life education center, remedial and developmental reading programs, and a community scientific laboratory. Technical specialists will be employed to introduce programs in areas of need.

Individualized Instruction

61. Program of Movement Education. A physical education program will be initiated with emphasis on individual instruction through creative problem-solving experiences. The program will be designed to assist children in learning how to move effectively, efficiently, and expressively for a variety of purposes.

62. Planning Model School Environments for Education Parks. An educational-park concept will be used to plan a comprehensive high school, an individualized

middle school, an elementary school and a preschool program. Emphasis will be on making specific plans for curricular experiences and facilities environments. The educational park concept is based on the assumption that school planning should be integrated with full community life.

63. Planning a Demonstration School Using Instructional Systems Design to Allow an Individual Curriculum for Each Student. A demonstration school will be planned, using an instructional systems approach to permit an ungraded, continuous-progress, individually paced program. The organizational sequence of instructional components will be planned so each student can benefit from sequences and methods tailored to his own needs.

64. Reporting Student Achievement in Terms of Modular Progress. A method will be developed to evaluate the achievement levels of all students, grades k-12, from four school districts. Evaluation will be on the basis of individual progress in terms of units of work completed rather than on a comparative basis with other students.

65. Educational Specifications for a Facility in which an Articulated and Integrated Program in Pre-Technology Can Best Be Accomplished. A special high school curriculum and facility will be planned to prepare average, capable, noncollege-bound students for post high school technological training programs. Planners will

attempt to identify an ideal environment in which interdisciplinary team teaching and the development of new techniques can be accomplished. A flexible, comprehensive structure will be designed and equipment lists will be prepared to expand experimentation with new materials.

Information Retrieval

66. Village School Project. A learning resources laboratory will be planned to supplement an existing demonstration classroom which is used for inservice training purposes. The laboratory will serve as an elementary library and materials center. Space will be allotted for book and reference areas, a television producing and recording area, an audiovisual room, a new media area, work space for teachers, and a computer-based information storage and retrieval system.

Inservice Programs

67. Institute on Critical Thinking and Inquiry. A teacher education program will be planned to provide instruction in both inquiry mode and interaction analysis methods to improve classroom teaching techniques. A teacher can evaluate himself through interaction analysis and he can be judged by fellow teachers, university personnel, and administrators through tapes of a "live class" lecture or discussion. An individualized approach will be used so that a teacher can concentrate on his own improvement.

68. Project for Improving Teacher Preparation. A program will be planned to improve the professional capabilities of selected teachers as clinical supervisors and as teachers of teaching strategies related to the development of improved processes. The inservice training will cover such areas as clinical supervision, interaction analysis, inquiry processes, creativity, development of thought processes, and the basic courses-math, english, and social studies.

69. Cooperative Production of Documentary Films on the Multi-Disciplinary Teaching of Class Research Topics. Inservice and preservice elementary teachers will be shown professionally advocated practices-the grouping of pupils within a class, individualizing of instruction, development of study or reading skills, the use of a variety of textbooks and references, the use of a creative approach to pupil's thinking and activity, and the multi-disciplinary approach to studying a topic. These practices will be evaluated by consultants and other observers of the films.

70. Project Facilitations. An inservice training program will be planned and self-assessment techniques will be used to help teachers and administrators improve the quality of existing programs and adapt innovations on the basis of local needs. The program will be primarily concerned with the need for demonstrating school

organizational communication systems encompassing research findings, survey data, and social expectations.

71. Project--Inservice Education. Alternatives such as supplementary centers, television, and new course offerings will be examined in terms of costs and benefits to modernize and improve programs for inservice teachers. The project is based on the premises that teacher education is a continuing experience and new teachers are not likely to be innovators.

Instructional Materials Centers

72. Feasibility Study of a Cooperative Instructional Resource and Materials Center for a County. A feasibility study will be conducted on the need for an instructional resource and materials center to serve all public and non-public schools in the county. Planners will determine which of a variety of suggestions will be included in such a center.

73. Planning for Expanded Regional Instructional Materials Center. Plans will be made for developing and expanding the services provided by three regional instructional materials centers which are now serving schools in seven counties. The objective is to make available modern educational equipment and materials and trained personnel to the public and nonpublic schools in the area.

74. Learning Opportunity Center. A learning opportunity center will be established to provide study facilities during periods when schools are not in session, including evenings and during the summer. The center will include a reference materials center, typing rooms, study carrels, and an audiovisual library. The primary objective will be to provide access to materials and aids for students, including a place for preparation. A second objective will be to provide a center for use and development of aids and materials by teachers in classrooms.

75. Educational Media Services Center. A media center will be planned to serve all schools in the county. The center will be staffed with professional media specialists to provide consultant advice to teachers and to procure, maintain, and produce educational media appropriate for each grade level, K-12.

76. Implementation of New Ideas. Plans will be made for incorporating modern methods and techniques into the school programs of a new primary school and a remodeled high school and junior high. Planning will include a nongraded curriculum, team teaching, and the use of an educational materials center with audiovisual aids.

77. Interdisciplinary, Multi-Media, Team Teaching Project for the Cultural and Psychological Integration of Secondary Curriculum. Plans will be made to improve the curriculum in grades 7-12 by using interdisciplinary, multi-media, and team teaching approaches. Emphasis will be on giving secondary and adult education students an understanding of the variety of cultures existing in the world, the impact of education on cultural change, and the interrelated significance of the disciplines included in the secondary curriculum.

78. Cultural and Educational Youth Development Center. Feasibility studies will be conducted of cultural enrichment, youth development, and educational planning programs to be served by a youth development center. The educational planning program will include an audiovisual production and distribution center with facilities for inservice teacher training, a curriculum library for teachers, preparation of educational materials for teachers, and a closed circuit TV transmitting station.

79. Exemplary Program Demonstrating an Educational Media Service Complex. A multipurpose center and related programs will be planned to improve educational opportunities and bring area educators into closer contact with new instructional practices and programs.

80. Model Saturated School Library. A community school library will be planned to operate as a materials center, study laboratory, and reading center to serve teachers, administrators, and students in a rural area.

81. Supplementary Education Center. A center will be established to provide a study library, a planetarium, an instructional materials center, a cultural center, and an observatory with a telescope.

Leadership Training Program

82. Leadership Training Program Demonstrated Through a Leadership Training Program in Elementary School. A leadership training program will be established in the elementary school mathematics curriculum of nine separate school districts. Participating teams will be requested to provide a written summary of the present state of their mathematics curriculum. During the following year, participants will file two progress reports concerning the implementation of the action plan, including problems encountered, solutions proposed and tried, results, needs satisfied and unsatisfied, and suggestions for the future development of similar training programs. An educational television station will be used to conduct biweekly colloquiums and to videotape participant experiences and program development.

Learning Resource

83. Coordinated Learning Resources Service. A learning resource service will be developed to serve all schools in the district. Planners will explore the potential of a number of resources in the county and will decide how to develop and link them into a coordinated service. The resources will be made available for an experience-oriented curriculum.

Maturity Tests

84. Study of School Readiness. The existing preschool and primary school situation in several communities will be studied and school readiness tests administered to determine the range and variability of maturity found in children, grades K-3. The degree to which school readiness affects the achievement of primary school children will be ascertained.

Mentally and Physically Handicapped

85. School and Sheltered Workshop for the Severe and Moderately Mentally Retarded. The feasibility of providing a community center for trainable and severely mentally retarded children will be explored. Planning will include the acquisition of land, construction of a building, and development of a curriculum to provide 1) preschool services, 2) an educational program with vocational objectives, 3) speech correction and therapy, and work stations for adults.

86. Program to Supplement Educational Services. Pupil Personnel needs will be investigated and a comprehensive system of mental health services will be planned to serve students in grades K-12. Supportive services which are needed include psychological and psychometric services, guidance and counseling, social worker services, and services for the mentally and physically handicapped.

Mental Health Program

87. Cooperative Exemplary School Mental Health Program. A mental health program will be planned to provide the following services: 1) an inservice training program for teachers and other professional school people in the application of mental health principles and techniques; 2) a parent-education program; and 3) a comprehensive program using expanded and coordinated services in the mental health field.

Natural Resources

88. Conservation and Rural Life Regional Center. Plans will be made for an outdoor education, conservation, and rural life regional center to serve students in a tri-county area. The program will provide opportunities for learning about natural resources at a time when urbanization is rapidly removing such opportunities. The program will include a laboratory for preservice and inservice education of teachers.

89. Planning for the Development and Operation of a Farm-Outdoor Education Resource Center. A farm-outdoor education center will be planned. Programs will be planned to give the students, who live in a metropolitan area, firsthand information about the sources of food, the relationship of food to the soil, and the techniques farmers use to produce food.

90. Natural History Museum and Research Center. A Natural History Museum and Research Center will be planned to serve students, teachers, student teachers, and laymen from four school districts. Plans will include converting an existing school facility into the Museum and Center. Students will be encouraged to collect, preserve, and display specimens under expert guidance and to do research on a real-life level.

91. Outdoor Program. An outdoor program will be planned for all students in the seventh and eighth grades from public and nonpublic schools. They will live for one week in an outdoor setting where they can gain such concepts as the interdependence of life forms through the study of pond ecology.

92. Outdoor Conservation Education Program. An outdoor conservation education program will be planned to provide study experiences related to the regular school curriculum, grades K-9, and the curriculum of a special education center in the ecology of the region.

Psychological Services

93. Supplementary Centers for Special Educational Evaluation and Services. Plans will be made for providing a number of diagnostic and remedial services to students in an 11-county area through a diagnostic center and a special education complex. Services will include comprehensive guidance and counseling, psychological and social work services, remedial instruction, and special education for different health problems.

Reading Instruction

94. Plans for the Use of the School Library as a Community Resource for Instruction. Plans will be made for using the school library as a resource center for after school, evening, and Saturday educational programs for students. Programs under consideration are, to name a few, developmental, remedial, tutorial, and small group instruction, and reading and communication skills courses.

95. Area Developmental Reading Center. A reading center will be planned to assist parents, teachers, and administrators in attacking the causes of reading disability and improving the reading skills of public and nonpublic elementary and secondary school students. The center will provide a corrective or remedial reading program, and provide inservice training for teachers.

School Redistricting

96. Planning to Determine Appropriate Functions and Services of a Multi-County Intermediate Education Unit. Ways to utilize recently enacted state education legislation will be explored by representatives from schools in a two-county area. The study will include an investigation of the county school system as an intermediate unit between the local unit of school administration and the state. Consultants will be invited to study the state laws and to offer advice on how to improve the total state educational climate by using or amending and improving the legislation.

97. Planning to Overcome the Educational Losses that Result from Consolidation and Reorganization of Rural Schools. Problems inherent in school district consolidations will be identified and methods developed to help parents and students adjust to and support a new school organization. Consultants will be hired to measure the psychological effect of consolidation on students and adults from formerly small school districts.

Science Centers

98. Regional Science Center. A regional science center will be planned to provide science programs and enrichment activities for pupils of all grade levels ranging from elementary through college and inservice education for teachers.

99. Educational Center. A center will be planned to include a planetarium, a space study area, a marine biology and fish hatchery area, and a horticulture laboratory. Programs in astronomy, space science, physics, mathematics, geography, mythology, and literature will be planned in sequential order appropriate to each grade level.

100. Earth-Space Science Laboratory. An earth-space science laboratory center will be planned to provide specialized facilities where students can observe simulated motions and relationships of heavenly bodies and conduct experiments to discover concepts in astronomy, earth science, and space. The center will consist of a complex of laboratories, a planetarium, special project rooms for experiments in physics, chemistry, meteorology, and biology, an exhibit area, and a workshop.

101. Planetarium, Observatory, and Exhibition Center. A combination planetarium, observatory, and exhibition hall will be planned to serve science education needs in a county. Space and earth science programs and exhibits of a manipulative and experimental nature will be included.

102. Planetarium and Museum of Arts and Sciences. A planetarium and museum of arts and sciences will be planned for 22 school districts and 6 private schools in 9 counties.

103. Teacher-Student Science Project. Teachers and students will spend 6 weeks during the summer isolating and investigating the aspergilli (a fungus). The project will serve as an inservice program for biology teachers. This program should demonstrate to other schools what research can be done by high school teachers.

Slow Learners

104. Demonstration Learning Center to Improve the Teaching of Communications Skills to Slow Learners. Students with an I.Q. of 70-90 will be taught communications skills in an inservice program to be planned for training beginning and experienced teachers in methods of teaching slow learners. Communications skills curriculum will be planned to emphasize verbalizing, listening, reading, and writing.

Student Reference Center

105. Student Reference Center. A student reference center will be planned to serve all secondary and out-of-school students of secondary school age in a metropolitan area. The center will be designed to provide multisensory approaches to learning, including books, audiovisual devices, and individual study carrels. Center services should offer enrichment experiences in literature, music, and other areas to all students, from the underachiever to the gifted.

Supplementary Educational Centers

106. Supplementary Educational Centers. The reorganization of grades K-6 will be planned to provide more flexibility in an elementary school program. Plans will include team teaching, integration of all racial and cultural groups, enriched programs for the gifted, average, and below average levels, and the use of materials and facilities to suit the needs of particular age levels.

107. Supplementary Educational Services Center. A multipurpose center will be planned to serve students in a rural, agricultural area. New teaching techniques and materials will be tested. Identification and education of gifted students, mentally retarded, and culturally disadvantaged will be planned, including preschool education for culturally disadvantaged.

108. Plan for a Supplementary Educational Center. Representatives of 12 counties will survey present school and community programs, investigate exemplary programs, and plan new programs to meet the needs of a sparsely populated rural area.

109. Supplementary Multipurpose Center. An assessment of all area educational, vocational, and cultural opportunities will be made to plan a center. The center will serve rural, economically deprived, and biracial communities whose youth are migrating to urban centers.

Team Teaching

110. Project for Elementary Team Teaching Program. An elementary team teaching program is to be developed to be used in a school with a flexible building design. Workshop participants will develop materials and a curriculum compatible with the team teaching concept.

111. Study of Local School Organization. A committee will study, conduct research, and plan for the use of team teaching and the development of ungraded patterns for school organizational operation. A school will be selected to serve as the target school.

Theatre Arts

112. A Cultural Enrichment Program. Music, ballet, drama, and museum activities will be presented to create both student and teacher awareness of fine arts programs available in the area and to develop interest for incorporating such programs into the curricula of the schools.

113. A Cultural Enrichment Opportunity for Drama Students. Secondary School drama and english literature students will attend one of a series of plays presented by a professional repertory theater group. Preview material concerning the play will be studied by the students and the students will meet with key members of the repertory company immediately following the performance for an extended question-and-answer period.

114. Operation Open Doors. A Saturday morning center for the arts will be planned to offer special activities in art, music, dance, drama, and play production, climaxed by a summer arts festival. Students from grades 5-12 who are talented in the five areas of activity will be given the opportunity to develop their talents.

115. Summer Humanities Workshop. An 8-week summer humanities workshop will afford a creative experience involving a cross-cultural approach to music, drama, design, painting, and dance for talented high school students. The medium of a musical stage production will be used.

Vocational Education

116. Model Vocational Education for the Slow Learner. A vocational program will be planned for the slow learner in conjunction with an area vocational technical school. Specialists will explore vocational opportunities which would utilize the manpower of slow learners. They will then determine teaching techniques to be used for slow learners.

117. Vocational-Technical Educational Plan. The facilities of a community college will be used as a training center for the vocational and technical education of 64 noncollege-bound high school students. The program will include courses not available in small high schools.

118. Feasibility Study of Curriculum Organization for Low Achieving Students. A school-community attack on the problem of dropout prevention will be planned for an urban area in a state where less than half of the students enrolled in grade 1 complete the 12th grade. A committee of 10 teachers develop a curriculum tailored to the needs of the low achieving, noncollege-bound students. Emphasis will be placed on provisions for realistic programs for the terminal student to prepare him for meaningful employment.

119. Integrating Outdoor Education with a Flexible Academic-Vocational Curriculum. Special attention will be given to terminal and marginal students and potential and actual dropouts. Vocational pursuits will be developed, including processing timber from logging to finished lumber, building with the finished lumber, and developing a wildlife pond.

120. Cooperative Vocational Program. Representatives of schools, businesses, and industries in a 6-county area will plan a vocational education program for high school students. The surrounding area will be surveyed for employment opportunities. The attitudes of businessmen toward training students will be assessed and existing facilities in the schools will be studied.

Section B

Cultural Enrichment

121. Concerts for Public Schools. Live musical concerts will be presented to young people having special emotional and behavioral problems in order to expose them to good music and to stimulate individual study in the field of music. The demonstration programs will be presented by small ensembles. Musical selections will be oriented to the age level and attention span of the listeners.

122. Cultural Uplift. A cultural enrichment program will be presented to elementary and secondary students in a county to introduce them to the performing arts and an exhibition of art masterpieces. A civic ballet company will present six evening programs. A baritone will give 21 concerts in various schools.

Individualized Instruction

123. Extended Classroom Project. An extended classroom will be planned to supplement regular classroom activities. The extended classroom will include study carrels wired with earphones, math stations, science stations, and areas set aside for quiet and active programs. The room will be used for individual instruction of students who need further stimulation to maintain interest, and for remedial work.

Instructional Materials Center

124. Media Center. A media center will be established to provide filmed materials, resources, graphic materials, and consultative services to all schools in a county. Specialists in media preparation and presentation will be hired to produce specialized materials and to provide inservice training to teachers in the design, development, preparation, and use of media. The center will include a graphic arts center for the production of visual materials through mechanical or manual means and craft production in metal, wood, or plastics. A procurement division will be responsible for borrowing display materials from museums and cultural agencies. A film production division will include a trailer-mounted mobile production unit with facilities for video taping selected production to be played back on tape or converted to film.

Learning Disabilities

125. Learning Disabilities Center Planning Study. A planning study will be conducted for a center offering educational programs and services to children handicapped by learning disabilities. The study group will explore methods of identifying children with learning disabilities, diagnostic procedures and materials used in clinics and educational settings, existing psychoeducational programs, and areas which control environmental influences.

Section C

Atomic Theory

126. Workshop in Nuclear Science. A workshop in nuclear science training will be conducted for 30 students and 30 teachers working in teams of one student and one teacher per team. Major objectives are to teach the basic principles and techniques of using radioisotopes, to inform participants about nuclear radiation, and to give the participants an insight into the complex teaching-learning situation.

Computer Program

127. Planning for Extensive Learning Systems Approach to Education. Educational programs using modern techniques for the improvement of both teaching and learning will be studied. Instructional, closed-circuit television and information storage and retrieval systems, including computer-based instruction, will be studied and structured by priority application to inschool curriculums, adult education, and cultural programs.

Cultural Enrichment

128. A Fine Arts Center for the Education, Enjoyment, and Cultural Enrichment of All. A fine arts center will be planned for outstanding historical memorabilia and a collection of paintings. The center will provide educational and cultural opportunities to all people of

129. Concerts for Public and Nonpublic Schools. A series of three live musical ensemble performances by professional musicians will be presented to children, grades 4-6, in the public and parochial schools in a metropolitan area. The musicians will demonstrate their instruments and explain the musical selections.

Curriculum Planning

130. Able Student Program. An honors program will be planned to benefit elementary and secondary students, including gifted, talented, and average but highly motivated students. Planning will include experimenting with new instructional ideas, flexible schedules, and new materials at two elementary schools. Present classes for able students at the secondary level will be studied for the purposes of improving the classes and planning a unified K-12 program.

131. Planning for Humanizing Emerging Curriculum Concepts and Educational Services. The basic educational needs of public and nonpublic school children in grades K-12 will be studied. Services to be considered include 1) establishment of a program center, 2) a fine arts program, 3) training in audiovisual production, 4) the use of an interdisciplinary approach to teaching science, mathematics, social sciences, and english, and 5) establishment of a planetarium and science laboratories.

132. Life-Oriented Curriculum. A life-oriented curriculum will be planned for elementary and secondary students. Objectives are to orient the curriculum around the areas of human life, work, play and human relations. The program will be based on the concept that career development begins at birth and continues throughout a lifetime.

133. Planning New Approaches to Meet the Educational and Cultural Needs of the Youth and Adults. A master plan will be developed using all appropriate educational, technical, cultural, and community resources to serve students in a two-county area. The programs should provide new and improved approaches to instruction, methods of curriculum development and teacher training, uses of instructional materials and systems of technology, methods of studying and guiding children physically, as well as mentally, and methods of providing cultural enrichment.

Data Processing

134. Book Catalog. A book catalog, produced in quantity by data-processing equipment, will replace the card catalog system presently in use in two junior high school libraries and will serve a third library in a junior high school annex. Students and teachers will have access to the catalog in classrooms, the public library, and the school library.

Educational Television

135. Civic Responsibility Center. A resource and information center will be planned to serve as a museum, a materials center, and a studio for transmission of programs over a local closed-circuit television system to all schools and homes in the community. Displays and lectures will be televised from the center.

Family Program

136. Planning for a Program of Exemplary Educational Services. Educational practices and program-management techniques will be studied to improve the quality of existing programs, to implement new programs, and to extend benefits of these programs to children and adults previously deprived of them. Under consideration are a family-life education center, remedial and developmental reading programs, and a community scientific laboratory.

Gifted Students

137. Center for Academic Excellence. A center will be planned to provide programs in mathematics, science, and language for very able students (top 2 percent of the school population). Program areas to be explored include interage grouping, a nongraded system in the basic subjects, programed instruction, team teaching, reorganization of the school day around a flexible schedule, coverage of material based on ability and interest, and classes at a nearby university and neighborhood schools.

Individualized Instruction

138. Optimum Fitness for All. An activities program will be constructed to meet the needs and interests of each individual child. A developmental and adapted physical education program will be planned for all students, grades K-12, with a low level of physical or motor fitness, faulty body mechanics and functional postural defects, nutritional abnormalities, and/or physical handicaps and for those who are recuperating from illnesses or operations.

139. Implementation of Nongraded Elementary Schools. The teaching staffs of two new elementary schools will participate in an orientation program during the summer and Saturday workshops and evening meetings during the school year to implement a nongraded system in their schools. The summer orientation program will be recorded and stored on video tape for use by participating teachers, staff members from other school systems, college students, and interested persons.

Interdisciplinary Approach

140. Regional Space Center. A space center will be planned adjacent to an existing museum and to two small planetariums now under construction. An interdisciplinary approach will be used in the center's programs, relating the space age with its social, economic, and political implications historically to man's ever

expanding attempts toward an understanding of his place in the universe. Programs will be closely related to the school curriculum in science and humanities and in-service training will be provided.

Learning Laboratory

141. Learning Laboratory for Georgraphy, Civics, and History. A learning laboratory will be established for teaching certain aspects of geography, civics, and history, using the same techniques that are used in laboratory teaching of science and foreign languages. The laboratory will also serve as an inservice center to conduct experiments in teaching methods and techniques.

Library Services

142. Expanded Library Services. Plans will be made to combine elementary school, high school, city, and county library services into one expanded service to better serve a rural area, including an Indian Reservation, the services of a library consultant, an educational consultant, and an architect.

Low Achievers

143. Instructional Materials for Low Achievers. The mathematical competence of low achieving seventh and eighth grade pupils should improve through a plan to provide materials specifically designed for them. Classroom teachers will prepare the materials.

Music

144. Summer Music Camp. A summer music camp will be offered to musically talented students. Intensive study in orchestral and ensemble techniques will be offered. Students will work in a full orchestra and in small ensembles as well as individually. Students will be grouped on the basis of ability and reassigned as they progress.

Natural Sciences

145. Summer Creative Learning Centers for Elementary School Pupils. Potentially creative students in grades 4-6 will be encouraged in their study of natural sciences through outdoor and cultural education. The program should provide the children, who live in a metropolitan area, an appreciation of the value of conservation. Independent exploration and experimentation will be stressed.

Remedial Reading

146. Remedial Reading Laboratory. A custom-built mobile unit will be purchased to provide remedial reading instruction to approximately 200 students in several elementary and secondary schools. A remedial reading teacher will conduct the program, covering comprehension, phonetics, and vocabulary. The teacher will have access to such equipment and materials as flannel boards, records, filmstrips, tape recorder, and tachistoscope.

Slow Learners

147. Project to Study the Needs of Slow Learners and to Plan Programs and Services to Meet Those Needs. School and community resources will be coordinated to provide maximum learning opportunities for slow learners. Planning will include health services, vocational rehabilitation programs, correctional services, cultural and recreational activities, inservice education of teachers and adult education of parents and interested laymen.

Socially Maladjusted

148. Guidance Center for the Socially Maladjusted Child. A guidance center will be established to provide group counseling to preschool and elementary school children from three counties. The objective is to identify and help socially maladjusted children at an early age.

Student Exchange Program

149. Student Learning Experience to Raise Aspirational Levels of Performance. A student exchange program will be instituted to serve students in a rural county. Eighth graders in the county will exchange places with students from a city junior high for one week. The rural students will attend regular classes in the city and cultural programs. The city students will live for a week during the winter in the county.

APPENDIX B

Exhibit 1.	Letter to Jury
Exhibit 2.	Analysis of Questionnaire Form
Exhibit 3.	List of Jury Members
Exhibit 4.	Letters to Project Directors
Exhibit 5.	The Questionnaire

April 1, 1968

_____
_____
_____

Dear _____:

Pursuant to our telephone conversation, I am enclosing a sample of the questionnaire which will eventually be sent to all project directors of terminated Title III (ESEA) projects.

Because of the expertise which you bring to this analysis of the questionnaire, your assistance is essential to the success of this study.

In the research study of which the enclosed questionnaire is a part, the researcher wishes to determine the status of former Title III projects after the withdrawal of federal Title III funds. In the case of those projects which are no longer in operation after the termination of the contract grant by the federal government, the study wishes to ascertain some of the underlying reasons for their lack of continuance.

It would be appreciated if you would follow this procedure: 1) answer the questionnaire as it would apply to your project; 2) employ the analysis form which has been provided as a guide to assist you in evaluating the questionnaire and writing your observations. A self-addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience.

I will be pleased to forward to you the results of this study.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Anthony J. Polemeni

35-55 73rd Street
Jackson Heights, New York
11372

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How long did it take you to answer this questionnaire?
   Length of time_____

2. Was the information for Category 4, Sections B and C easily accessible? Yes_____No_____
   If not, would you explain some of the difficulties encountered?

3. In Category 5, would you have any suggestions for additional reasons for discontinuance of projects?

4. Are the questions free from ambiguity and other invalidating features? Yes_____No_____

5. Are the directions clear, complete, and acceptable?
   Yes_____No_____
   If not, would you indicate problem areas?

6. Do you feel that the items are placed in a sound psychological and logical sequence? Yes____No____
   If not, please explain.

7. Would you have any suggestions for improving the format of the questionnaire?

8. Additional Comments: (if any)

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE AND THIS ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE PROVIDED FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE. THANK YOU ONCE AGAIN.

JURY OF ESEA TITLE III PROJECT DIRECTORS WHO READ A PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUBMITTED SUGGESTIONS FOR REVISION

Devitt, Joseph J. Member of Administration Office, Bureau of Elementary Education and Supervision, Maine State Department of Education, Augusta, Maine

Fortier, Gerald. Coordinator of Language Instruction, Springfield Public Schools, Springfield, Mass.

Haney, Thesesa. Director of Special Resources and Experimental Programs, Akron Public Schools, Akron, Ohio.

Hutchinson, Earl. Director of Operation Lighthouse, Bath Board of Education, Bath, Maine.

Marcus, Jerry. Member of Administration Office, Union Free School District No. 22, Farmingdale, New York.

Marsh, Richard. Member of Administration Office, Columbus Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio

Petranek, Chester J. Member of Administration Office, Rockville, Maryland.

Rituper, Stephen. Curriculum Division Chairman, Bethlehem School District, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

Sine, David F. Director of Research, Syracuse City School District, Syracuse, New York.

Vieland, Constance. Member of Administration Office, Princeton Borough Board of Education, Princeton, New Jersey.

Anthony J. Polemeni
35-55 73rd Street
Jackson Heights,
New York 11372

April 27, 1968

Dear Project Director:

As a former Project Director of an ESEA Title III program, your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire concerning Title III projects is vital to the successful administration of this program.

In the research study of which the enclosed questionnaire is a part, the author wishes to determine the status of former Title III projects after the withdrawal of federal Title III funds. In the case of those projects which are no longer in operation after the termination by the Federal Government of the contract grant, the study wishes to ascertain some of the underlying reasons for their lack of continuance.

The topic for this study was suggested by the staff members of the United States Office of Education. It is hoped that the findings of this study will be significant and of value for the future administration of Title III projects. Your participation will make a meaningful contribution in enabling the United States Office of Education to make a realistic appraisal of Title III projects and to remove some of the pitfalls to the furtherance of these projects after the federal contract has been terminated. Your help is essential to the success of this study.

When the questionnaire is completed, please return it in the self-addressed envelope which has been provided. Responses will be held in confidence. No individual, school, or district will be identified in the results of this research. A copy of the summary of the findings will be sent to you, should you choose to have a copy.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in this study.

Sincerely yours,

Anthony J. Polemeni

Anthony J. Polemeni
35-55 73rd Street
Jackson Heights,
New York 11372

May 28, 1968

Dear Project Director:

I am enclosing, for a second time, a questionnaire which seeks to determine the status of former ESEA Title III projects after the withdrawal of federal Title III funds. Fully cognizant of the many pressures upon you at this time of the school year, I would be very grateful if you could spare ten minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

It is hoped that the findings of this study will be significant and of value for the future administration of Title III projects. Your participation will make a meaningful contribution in enabling the U.S. Office of Education to make a realistic appraisal of Title III projects and to remove some of the pitfalls to the furtherance of these projects after the federal contract has been terminated.

When the questionnaire is completed, please return it in the self-addressed envelope which has been provided. Responses will be held in confidence. No individual, school, or district will be identified in the results of this research. A copy of the summary of the findings will be sent to you, should you choose to have a copy.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in this study.

Sincerely yours,

Anthony J. Polemeni

QUESTIONNAIRE

CATEGORY 1

Name of Project Director

Address
Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code)

CATEGORY 2

Project Title

Project Number

Major Description of Project: (Check ONE only)

____Innovative ____Adaptive ____Exemplary

CATEGORY 3

Please indicate by check mark the section which describes the status of project listed in Category 2. (Only ONE section is to be checked).

Section A — This project became defunct with withdrawal of Title III funds immediately at the end of the designated approval period. _____

Section B — This project was in operation for a period of time after the withdrawal of Title III funds at the end of the designated approval period, but is currently not in operation. _____

Section C — This project is currently in operation, since the withdrawal of Title III funds at the end of the designated approval period. _____

IF YOU HAVE CHECKED SECTION A, IT WILL NOT BE NECESSARY TO RESPOND TO THE ITEMS IN CATEGORY 4. PLEASE PROCEED DIRECTLY TO CATEGORY 5.

CATEGORY 4

This category is to be answered only by those respondents who checked SECTION B in Category 3.

Section B, Category 4

If the Title III project was in operation for a period of time after the withdrawal of Title III funds, but is presently not in operation, please indicate

1. For how long was the project in operation after the withdrawal of Title III funds?

   Length of Time_____

2. What was the TOTAL yearly expenditure after the withdrawal of Title III funds?

   Total_____

3. What was the yearly cost for each of the following categories after the withdrawal of Title III funds?

Expenditure Accounts	Salaries Prof.	Salaries Non-Prof.	Matls. & Supplies	Contracted Services
Administration				
Instruction				

4. After the withdrawal of Title III funds, what was the size of student population served?

   Total_____

5. What were the sources of funding after the withdrawal of Title III funds? Please specify below.

   Foundation Grant
   Please Specify_____Amt._____

   Federal Support
   Please Specify_____Amt._____

   State Support
   Please Specify_____Amt._____

CATEGORY 4

This category is to be answered only by those respondents who have checked SECTION C in Category 3.

Section C, Category 4

If the Title III project after the withdrawal of Title III funds is currently in operation, please indicate

1. Present TOTAL yearly or anticipated yearly expenditure.

   Total_____

2. What is the yearly or anticipated yearly expenditure for each of the following categories after the withdrawal of Title III funds?

Expenditure Accounts	Salaries Prof.	Non-Prof.	Matls. & Supplies	Contracted Services
Administration				
Instruction				

3. What is the present size of student population served?
   Total_____

4. What are the sources of funding since the withdrawal of Title III funds?

   Foundation Grant
   Please Specify_____Amt._____

   Federal Support
   Please Specify_____Amt._____

   State Support
   Please Specify_____Amt._____

   Local Board of Education
   Please Specify_____Amt._____

   Other
   Please Specify_____Amt._____

IF YOU HAVE RESPONDED TO SECTION C, CATEGORY 4, IT WILL NOT BE NECESSARY TO ANSWER CATEGORY 5.

Local Board of Education
Please Specify_____Amt._____

Other
Please Specify_____Amt._____

PLEASE PROCEED TO CATEGORY 5

CATEGORY 5

Please indicate to what extent you feel the following reasons entered into the decision NOT TO CONTINUE the Title III project after the withdrawal of Title III funds. For each tiem, please respond with one of the options: greatly, somewhat, or not at all.

	Greatly	Somewhat	Not At All
1. The school district (re-tion, etc.) was unable to absorb the costs of pro-ject after the withdrawal of funds.	_____	_____	_____
2. Evaluation findings demon-strated that the project did not warrant continu-ance.	_____	_____	_____
3. There was a lack of suffi-ciently trained personnel.	_____	_____	_____
4. There was much unfavor-able public reaction to project.	_____	_____	_____
5. There was too great a control exercised on the part of the U.S. Office of Education, Title III Bureau.	_____	_____	_____
6. There was too great a con-trol exercised on the part of the State Education Dept.	_____	_____	_____
7. There was a lack of ad-ministrative support at the State level.	_____	_____	_____
8. There was a lack of admin-istrative support at the local level.	_____	_____	_____
9. There was a lack of admin-istrative support at the Federal level.	_____	_____	_____
10. Other projects demonstrated greater need and importance.	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE

CATEGORY 5

	Greatly	Somewhat	Not At All
11. The project personnel were unable to "sell" the program to the school district.	_____	_____	_____
12. The methods and procedures developed to continue the project without Title III funds were inadequate.	_____	_____	_____
13. The timing of funding was a causative factor.	_____	_____	_____
14. The project was viewed by the local school agency as an outside program imposing upon the teachers' time and energies.	_____	_____	_____
15. Curriculum materials were found to be inadequate.	_____	_____	_____

Additional Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

IF YOU WISH A SUMMARY OF THIS STUDY, PLEASE INDICATE BY CHECK MARK. _____

APPENDIX C

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL SALARIES: MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES: AND CONTRACTED SERVICES

Exhibit 1.	Section B Projects Tables 29-34
Exhibit 2.	Section C Projects Tables 35-40

TABLE 29

Section B Projects

Dollar expenditure by administration for professional salaries with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
121	$ 1,500	406	1,094
122	850	0	850
123	12,000	0	12,000
124	40,101	15,000	25,101
125	1,114	0	1,114
Totals	55,565	15,406	

TABLE 30

Section B Projects

Dollar expenditure by administration for non-professional salaries with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
121[a]			
122[a]			
123	4,500	0	4,500
124	0	8,000	8,000
125	493	0	493
Totals	4,993	8,000	

[a]No funds were requested for this area.

TABLE 31

Section B Projects

Dollar expenditure for instructional professional salaries with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
121	$ 5,000	0	5,000
122	12,300	0	12,300
123	17,500	400	17,100
124	131,728	0	131,728
125[a]			
Totals	166,528	400	

TABLE 32

Section B Projects

Dollar expenditure for instructional non-professional salaries with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
121[a]			
122[a]			
123	6,000	600	5,400
124[a]			
125[a]			
Totals	6,000	600	

[a]No funds were requested for this area.

TABLE 33

Section B Projects

Dollar Expenditure for materials and supplies with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
121	0	370	370
122	3,278	400	2,878
123	990	0	990
124	5,840	2,000	3,840
125	304	0	304
Totals	10,412	2,770	

TABLE 34

Section B Projects

Dollar Expenditure for contracted services with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
121	$ 0	5,224	5,224
122	9,692	0	9,692
123	11,150	0	11,150
124[a]			
125[a]			
Totals	20,842	5,224	

[a]No funds requested for this area.

TABLE 35

Section C Projects

Dollar expenditure by administration for professional salaries with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
126	$ 4,000	1,000	3,000
127	2,995	1,000	1,995
128	12,000	0	12,000
129	0	20,600	20,600
130	10,200	0	10,200
131	65,550	5,000	60,550
132	0	7,000	7,000
133	10,000	14,300	4,300
134	4,378	3,000	1,378
135	5,400	5,000	400
136	19,450	36,000	16,550
137	3,286	0	3,286
138[a]	4,000		
139[a]	1,200		
140	34,500	16,000	18,500
141	294	0	294
142[b]			
143	15,240	0	15,240
144[a]	1,625		
145[a]	1,874		
146	10,789	500	10,289
147	7,588	1,000	6,588
148[a]	625		
149	4,600	0	4,600
Totals	219,594	110,400	

[a]No figures were given.

[b]No funds requested for this area.

TABLE 36

Section C Projects

Dollar expenditure by administration for non-professional salaries with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
126	180	200	20
127	2,500	500	2,000
128	3,000	0	3,000
129[a]			
130[a]			
131	0	2,000	2,000
132	5,518	0	5,518
133	3,427	0	3,427
134	8,924	1,000	7,924
135	1,398	0	1,398
136	20,548	9,000	11,548
137	685	0	685
138[a]			
139[a]			
140	3,600	4,000	400
141[a]			
142[a]			
143	3,238	0	3,238
144[a]			
145[b]	180		
146[a]			
147	2,736	0	2,736
148[b]	834		
149	1,026	0	1,026
Totals	57,794	16,700	

[a]No funds were requested for this area.

[b]No figures were given.

TABLE 37

Section C Projects

Dollar expenditure for instructional professional salaries with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
126	$ 6,350	6,500	150
127	12,010	2,000	10,010
128[a]			
129[a]			
130	20,000	20,000	
131	0	5,000	5,000
132	30,480	0	30,480
133	15,553	37,950	22,397
134[a]			
135	0	5,000	5,000
136	17,200	62,000	44,800
137[a]			
138[b]	15,972		
139[b]	20,588		
140	0	25,000	25,000
141	2,825	7,500	4,675
142	2,105	3,000	895
143[a]			
144[b]	4,469		
145[b]	22,223		
146	7,700	14,000	6,300
147	47,441	8,500	38,941
148[b]	7,531		
149	5,099	9,660	4,561
Totals	237,546	206,110	

[a]No funds were requested for this area.

[b]No figures were given.

TABLE 38

Section C Projects

Dollar expenditure for instructional non-professional salaries with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
126	$ 90	300	210
127[a]			
128[a]			
129[a]			
130[a]			
131[a]			
132[a]			
133	1,332	3,750	2,418
134			
135			
136	12,966	79,000	66,034
137[a]			
138[b]	2,609		
139[b]	75		
140[a]			
141[a]			
142[a]			
143[a]			
144[a]			
145[a]			
146			
147	1,916	0	1,916
148[a]			
149	2,452	4,728	2,276
Totals	21,440	87,778	

[a]No funds were requested for this area.

[b]No figures were given.

TABLE 39

Section C Projects

Dollar expenditure for materials and supplies with Title III funds and following termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
126	$ 125	7,000	6,875
127	1,995	400	1,595
128	0	1,000	1,000
129	0	7,925	7,925
130	1,000	2,000	1,000
131	10,006	0	10,006
132	4,629	3,500	1,129
133	3,200	5,300	2,100
134	0	6,000	6,000
135	312	8,600	8,288
136	5,000	66,700	61,700
137	259	0	259
138[a]	200		
139[a]	1,229		
140	3,500	31,000	27,500
141	567	900	333
142	531	600	69
143	4,391	12,000	7,609
144[a]	1,665		
145[a]	2,852		
146	3,089	1,000	2,089
147	1,735	500	1,235
148[a]	713		
149	0	300	300
Totals	47,000	154,725	

[a]No figures were given.

TABLE 40

Section C Projects

Dollar expenditure for contracted services with Title III funds and following the termination of Title III funding

Project Number	With Title III Funds	Without Title III Funds	Difference
126[a]	$		
127	2,800	0	2,800
128[a]			
129	99,996	73,250	26,746
130[a]			
131	3,547	0	3,547
132	561	0	561
133	2,555	5,736	3,181
134[a]			
135	2,424	0	2,424
136		200,000	200,000
137	1,307	0	1,307
138[a]			
139[b]	2,625	0	2,625
140	32,400	2,000	30,400
141[a]			
142	940	0	940
143[a]			
144[a]			
145[a]			
146	1,000	0	1,000
147	1,833	0	1,833
148[a]			
149[a]			
Totals	151,988	280,986	

[a]No funds were requested for this area.

[b]No figures were given.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Campbell, Roald F., Cunningham, Luvern L., and McPhee, Roderick F. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merill Books, Inc., 1965.

Educational Policies Commission. Educational Responsibilities of the Federal Government. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1964.

Munger, Frank J., and Fenno, Richard F. Jr. National Politics and Federal Aid to Education. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962.

Pierce, Truman M. Federal, State, and Local Government in Education. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Tiedt, Sidney W. The Role of the Federal Government in Education. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Articles and Periodicals

Burck, Gilbert. "Knowledge: The Biggest Growth Industry of Them All," Fortune, LXX (November, 1964), pp. 127-142.

Drew, Elizabeth Brenner. "Education's Billion-Dollar Baby," Atlantic Monthly, CCXVIII (July, 1966), pp. 37-43.

Exton, Elaine. "Congressional Subcommittee Studies Role of U.S. Office of Education," The American School Board Journal, CLIII (October, 1966), pp. 5-7.

"Federal Money for Education," American Education, III (March, 1967), p. 23.

Georgiady, Nicholas P. "The State Department of Education and Federal Funding," Educational Leadership, XXIV (October, 1966), pp. 25-27.

Masters, Nicholas A., and Pettit, Lawrence K. "Some Changing Patterns in Educational Policy Making," Educational Administration Quarterly, II (Spring, 1966), pp. 81-100.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

McKay, Robert E. "The President's Program: A New Commitment to Quality and Equality in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXXVI (May, 1965), pp. 427-429.

Smith, Paul E., and Howe, Harold II. "Schoolmen worry: Will federal aid to education do more harm than good in the long run?," Nation's Schools, LXXVIII (February, 1966), pp. 48-52.

"Spending the Federal Aid Billions," American School and University, XXXIX (December, 1966), pp. 27-53.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. "The Use and ABuse of Evaluation in Title III and a Description of a Proposed CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) Model for Evaluating ESEA Title III Projects." Paper presented at the National Seminar on Innovation sponsored by the Kettering Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education, Honolulu, Hawaii, July, 1967.

The New York Times. April 12, 1965, p. 1.

"View from the Top: Congressmen Look at Evaluation." PACEreport, November, 1967, pp. 5-8.

"What Title III Projects Need: More Innovation." Nation's Schools, LXXVIII (August, 1966), pp. 42-45.

Worthein, Blaine R. "Evolution of Title III: A Study in Change," Theory Into Practice, VI (June, 1967), pp. 104-111.

Public Documents

New York State Department of Education. Federal Aid Handbook. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1966.

New York State Department of Education. New York State Supplement to USOE Manual for PACE Project Applicants. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1966.

New York State Department of Education. Preliminary Guidelines for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1965.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

U.S. Congress. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Pub. L. 89-10, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. H.R. 143.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Notes and Working Papers Concerning the Administration of Programs, Title III, ESEA. 90th Cong., 1st Sess., 1967.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965. 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965.

U.S. Congressional Record. 89th Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 5893-5944.

U.S. Office of Education. Focus on PACE. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

U.S. Office of Education. Stepping Up With PACE. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Office of Education. Supplementary Centers and Services Program: A Manual for Project Applicants. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Unpublished Material

Bennion, John Warren. "The Formation of Federal Educational Policy in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1966.

VITA

Name	Anthony John Polemeni
Date of birth	February 1, 1935
Elementary School **Date Graduated**	St. Charles Borromeo January, 1949
High School **Date Graduated**	St. Anthony's High School June, 1952
Baccalaureate Degree **College** **Date**	Bachelor of Arts St. Francis College August, 1957
Other Degrees	Master of Arts Columbia University November, 1964
Armed Services **Branch** **Length of Service**	
Ordination **Seminary** **Date**	